COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Volume II WINTER 1950 Number 1

Franco-German Literary Relations: A Survey of Problems. By Henri Peyre 1

Zanella, Coleridge, and Shelley. By A. Lytton Sells 16

Los tratos de Argel. By Joaquín Casalduero 31

Edmund Gayton on Don Quixote, Andrés, and Juan Haldudo. By Edward M. Wilson 64

Dryden and the Rules: The Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*. By John C. Sherwood 73

Book Reviews 84

The Myth of Felt, by Leonardo Olschki (J. E. Shaw). *André Gide et la pensée allemande*, by Renée Lang (Jacqueline E. de La Harpe). *German Literature in British Magazines, 1750-1860*, by Walter Roloff and others (W.P.F.). *Dante's American Pilgrimage*, by Angelina La Piana (W.P.F.). *Journal de Delécluze*, ed. by Robert Baschet (Marie D. Molles-Stein).

Books Received 96

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature Section of the Modern Language Association of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the postoffice at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor

CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

AUSTIN WARREN
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, and with broad views of movements, genres, periods, and authors—from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on broad topics and problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00. Correspondence concerning subscriptions or exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME II WINTER 1950 NUMBER 1

FRANCO-GERMAN LITERARY RELATIONS: A SURVEY OF PROBLEMS

HENRI PEYRE

NO OTHER domain of comparative literature is so rich and so relatively little explored as that of the literary relations between France and Germany in the last one hundred and fifty years.[1] Few foreign writers, not even Byron and Dostoevsky, have meant so much for Germany as Stendhal, Balzac, Zola, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, and, more recently, Gide, Claudel, Valéry; and earlier writers, Rousseau, the seventeenth-century *moralistes*, and Pascal, have continued to act as potent forces upon many a German writer. "Pascal and I," said Nietzsche, who later in *Ecce Homo* added with no less pride, "I do not read Pascal; I love him." And, on the other hand, Germany has disturbed, fascinated, and often fecundated French thinkers and writers. The history of Goethe in France is more important than that of Byron or, in modern France, even that of Shakespeare. Neither Keats nor Browning nor Blake counts today for the French to the same extent as Hölderlin and Rilke. No novelist, except Faulkner, equals Kafka in his influence upon the younger French generation. Hegel, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Heidegger have no peers among thinkers in the vitality with which contemporary France reinterprets them.

What is more, any discussion of France by a German writer, of Germany by a competent French observer, soon touches upon the funda-

[1] The present article, in its essentials, was presented before Comparative Literature Group VII (Franco-German Relations) of the Modern Language Association on Dec. 30, 1948.

mental European problem of our age—the Franco-German problem. Scholars cannot eschew it without hypocrisy or timidity. Any interpretation of literature which refuses to divorce literature from life becomes an interpretation of that elusive but none the less real entity, the soul of a people. E. R. Curtius wrote a book on the "civilization" of France, and almost every eminent French specialist of German letters (Andler, Lichtenberger, Reynaud, Vermeil, and the latest and not the least ambitious, Minder[2]) is soon driven to attempt an analysis of the German soul. It is better to have well-informed and presumably objective scholars undertake such a necessary task than to leave it to psychoanalysts, hasty travelers, and casual commentators.

Yet the province of Franco-German relations has tempted but few American workers. Many an apprentice is led to study in his dissertation some uninspiring minor figure or some lifeless topic hitherto neglected, probably for valid reasons, when he could find far more nourishment for his exploration and for his reflection in French, or German, literature, envisaged in some aspect of its foreign relations. This inertia is no doubt to be traced to our acceptance of departmental barriers which enclose us in a comfortable but narrow fold and justify our lack of curiosity in all else. The link between the Romance languages, derived as languages from a common source, has led us to stress, as if it were equally close, the kinship between the so-called Romance literatures. But since about 1660 French literature has been more intimately related with English and German letters than with Italian or Spanish. The departments of German, for their part, have required of their students the study of Gothic, Old Norse, High and Middle High German, all legitimate and important courses, no doubt; and yet whoever will spend his life teaching and commenting upon Lessing, Goethe, Nietzsche, and Rilke might profit more from a deeper acquaintance with French literature.

American specialists in French or German literature have probably harmed themselves also by accepting too eagerly the mood and the tone of the native students of these literatures. Some American specialists insist upon writing in French or German and, what is worse, upon emulating foreign scholars in their most repelling stylistic idiosyncrasies. Some observers have rightly blamed American scholarship in the German field[3] for thus making itself inaccessible to many who, while not specializing in those studies, are prepared to read and enjoy Rilke and Mann. This creates, in their view, an "unhealthy intellectual isolation" for the otherwise remarkable body of Germanic studies produced

[2] Robert Minder, *Allemagnes et Allemands* (Paris, 1948). Other volumes are to follow. See our review of the book in *French Review*, XXII (1948), 50-52.

[3] Henry C. Hatfield and Joan Merrick, "Studies of German Literature in the United States, 1939-1946," *Modern Language Review*, XLIII (1948), 353-392.

in America and fosters a tendency to look up to Germanic culture as "the supreme pinnacle of intellectual achievement." American teachers of French should similarly avoid the pitfall into which native French critics and historians have often stumbled, from Michelet to Bainville and Louis Reynaud—nationalism. Geographically as well as ethnically, through the variety of racial and national elements from which American scholars spring and through the breadth of view and the relative objectivity which should be theirs, America might well have an especially valuable and original contribution to make to the study of Franco-German literary relations.

A field of study which has received inadequate attention is the knowledge and teaching of the German language in France since the days of Napoleon. When was such teaching introduced into the curricula? How was the language taught? What was the training required of *lycée* teachers before the *agrégation* of German was founded? How were the university professorships of modern literatures assigned, and to whom? Where could a man like Taine or Romain Rolland acquire a knowledge of German in his youth? Special consideration should be given to the anthologies in which French schoolboys patiently deciphered, sometimes learned by heart with the rapture of discovery, and perhaps remembered all their lives a ballad by Lenau or Goethe, a page from Eichendorff or Sudermann. A biographical sketch of Kleist, a picture of Novalis in one of those schoolbooks, may have acted powerfully, in the mysterious working of "influences," upon many a French boy's imagination, even if he failed ever to master the rules of German construction.

Much as it may grieve teachers of language to own it, the reality of a foreign influence is only remotely related to the actual reading of the foreign text in the original. Several studies, the best being by P. Lévy,[4] have established the fact that the French romantics, as a rule, spoke very little if any German and hardly ever attempted to read it. The German language filled them with awe and usually kept them at a respectful distance.

> Leur langue a les grands plis du manteau d'une reine;
> La pensée y descend dans un vague profond.

Thus wrote Lamartine, who never practiced that queenly language and whose thought needed no German models in order to wrap itself up in vagueness. Musset and Hugo did not read their German contemporaries in the original. In spite of his pseudonym, supposedly derived from Winckelmann's birthplace, and his three-year stay in Germany with Napoleon's armies, Stendhal never mastered German. Emile Deschamps translated German poets into French verse with the help of

[4] P. Lévy, "Les Romantiques français et la langue allemande," *Revue germanique*, XXIX (1938), 225-252.

prose trots. Nerval himself confessed that he might have starved in Austria if he had had to order his meals in German; but he knew the written language (in spite of many glaring mistranslations in his *Faust*) and often felt it even better than he knew it.

The extent of an influence cannot be measured by the quantitative knowledge of the original possessed by the author or artist undergoing the influence. Translations play a great part, too often underestimated. Conversions in a café, encounters with a connoisseur of Germany in a salon or in a stage coach, may have been important in molding the French romantic's view of Germany. Works of art, even poorly reproduced—Delacroix's etchings of *Faust*, and Berlioz' opera—did more than many a reading of Goethe's original text to fire French imagination. Though he never learned Greek, Keats is the most Hellenic of the English poets and displays more insight into the spirit of Greek mythology and art than poets like Landor and Swinburne who could compose Greek verse. Goethe studied conscientiously in order to write his frigid *Achilleis*, then confessed, when giving up the attempt, that "only faulty knowledge is creative." Any foreign influence is in part a myth and a mirage, and there lies the secret of its fascination. If the French romantic poets—and Michelet and Balzac differed little from poets in this—had spent several years reading their German predecessors in the original, they might conceivably have ceased writing poetry altogether. What their distorted but creative vision of Germany was, independent of their fragmentary knowledge, is the true question to be asked by the comparative scholar.

Also of great significance is a second group of studies—the intermediaries between Germany and France. We should have first an exhaustive list of translations from German authors and a study of some of those translations. Their insufficiencies in accuracy and fidelity matter little. The important questions are: How did they read in French? What notion of the German original, deformed or transformed, did they convey to the Frenchman of 1830 or 1860?

The place of German letters in French periodicals should also be weighed with care; the leading journals often matter less than the little-known and ephemeral ones. Monographs on the first *Revue germanique* (1829-37) and on the *Revue du nord* would be welcome. A detailed study of the idea of Germany and German letters given to the readers of 1852-70 by the second *Revue germanique*,[5] as well as by the *Revue européenne*, the *Revue nationale*, and several others, would be very rewarding. The so-called symbolist journals (*Revue indépendante*, *Entretiens politiques et littéraires*, etc.) carried articles on Novalis,

[5] See R. Martin, "La Fondation et les débuts de la *Revue germanique* [of Dollfus and Nefftzer]," *Revue germanique*, I (1905), 262-276 and II, 384-397.

Lenau, Hoffmann; a close study of these journals is a prerequisite to the important book which must some day be written on French symbolism and German romanticism. The third *Revue germanique* (1905-39) and other periodicals actively interested in foreign letters, such as *Le Navaire d'argent, Les Cahiers du sud, La Nouvelle Revue française, La Revue rhénane,* etc., should be examined for the more recent period.

Travelers in Germany were also intermediaries and have not received the attention that French travelers in England, Scotland, and Ireland have been given. Quinet, Ampère, and Michelet followed Madame de Staël, Constant, and their group into the romantic land of Germany. Hugo spoke only one word of German (*Kellner!*) but managed to write a splendid book on *The Rhine,* plundering shamelessly but successfully an obscure predecessor. Contrary to a view commonly held, the French were and still are eager and shrewd travelers, and Germany was one of their favorite places of pilgrimage, long before Bayreuth. It would be valuable to know precisely when they began to observe the transition from the dreamy and mediaeval Germany to the land of the Industrial Revolution, then to the Germany of Sadowa and Bismarck. Other travelers who deserve special attention are Gobineau, Mézières, Taine, Michelet, Le Play, an independent-minded engineer who observed mines and labor conditions in Germany, traveling on foot, before writing on *European Workmen* (1855) and advocating a social reform in France which was to impress Bourget and Pétain. Travel diaries of Frenchmen who studied in Germany after 1871, such as Gaston Paris, Lasserre, and Maritain, and reports and analyses on the coming of Nazism to Germany, often powerfully and dispassionately described by Frenchmen or Swiss (Denis de Rougemont, Robert d'Harcourt, Chevrillon, Gillet, and Rivaud, the author of a remarkable if too lenient study, *Le Relèvement de l'Allemagne,* 1939), would provide rich material.

Two other categories of intermediaries should not be neglected—the French scholars and men of letters who interpreted German letters and the German *Geist* to France, and the Germans who, living in France, played a similar role. Such living contacts are often the most fecund of all; and the charm and ardor of a foreign visitor or exile may count more than the accuracy of his knowledge or the finish of his written work.

Six important Germanists of the romantic age deserve special mention: Philarète Chasles (though occasionally unreliable), Ampère, Xavier Marmier, de Lerminier, Blaze de Bury, and Saint-René Taillandier. Late in the nineteenth century towers a great figure, that of Edouard Schuré, a fine, enraptured, but lucid writer on Wagner's musical drama, on Germany in general, and on the mystics among the poets.

Schuré, an ardent champion of poetry and of spiritual beauty who did much to defeat positivism in the decade 1870-80 in France, has not yet received his due. In the twentieth century, much remains to be done on Andler and other French academic students of German letters, whose action (for their knowledge was action and quickened activity as well as thought, as Nietzsche required of all knowledge in the third of his *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen*) extended far beyond the precincts of universities; the interpretation of Germany given by Seillière, well informed if a captive of his theories, Du Bos (on Goethe, Hofmannsthal, Nietzsche, Rilke), Jaloux (on the German romantics), Robert d'Harcourt, and Béguin, all nonacademic critics with a wide audience, also deserve monographs.

Germans prove remarkably adaptable when they live in a foreign country, except perhaps in stubbornly refusing to degermanize their style. Several emigrated to France, before 1848 and after, and contributed much to French classical scholarship (Hillebrand, Dübner). Many liberals of the "Young Germany" group, after 1830, flocked to Paris and observed French affairs with eagerness, though not without a nostalgic longing for the Vaterland; Börne and Heine are the most famous. Michael Beer and his brother, the musician Meyerbeer, Heinrich Laube, Gutzkow, Gans, Herwegh, Hebbel, and Wagner also had interesting, if mixed, experiences in the Paris of the early 1840s. The picture of France extracted from their works is a contradictory one which it would be rewarding to draw. Later, Alexander Weill, a strange Alsatian Jew who was a friend of Heine and wrote on him, acted as a prophet of occultism and as a revealer of the Kabbala to Hugo. Robert Dreyfus' book on Weill, done in 1908, needs rewriting, since much new material has come to light. The period between the two world wars saw many Germans established in France and acting as disseminators of ideas—Count von Kessler, whom Gide knew well; Rudolf Kassner, who published studies on Kierkegaard and other mystical philosophers, in *Commerce* and *Corona*, and was in close touch with eminent French writers (Gide, Valéry); Bernard Groethuysen, born in Berlin of a Dutch father and a Russian mother, a pupil of Dilthey and a Marxist, who settled in France after 1932, where he became not only a French writer in his own right but a powerful and admired influence upon men like Malraux. Ernst Erich Noth is among the most conspicuous German exiles in France who came to belong to French literature. The whole emigration from Nazi Germany of the years 1932-44 will some day have to be studied as second in importance only to the Huguenot flight from France in 1685-1715 and the French emigration of 1791-1802.

If we now glance at some of the individual French writers of the nineteenth century whose debt to, or relations with, Germany have received inadequate attention, we shall be surprised at the number of important subjects thus far neglected by comparative scholars. If Madame de Staël has been repeatedly discussed, Benjamin Constant has not, except in his pathetic but wearisome love affairs and in *Adolphe*. His great work, *De la religion*, composed in his old age but embodying many thoughts of his earlier years, deserves a close study, for it announces much of the religious attitude of the rest of the century. It owes something to Herder, as Tronchon has shown, to Creuzer, and to other Germans. The years 1804 and following in Constant's copious *Journal intime* display a wide range of German readings, of visits to German authors (Goethe, Schiller, Wieland, Thielmann, Novalis' brother-in-law, Fr. Schlegel, etc.). No other French writer of the first order (before Taine and Renan) understood German metaphysics so lucidly as did Constant. Victor Cousin disfigured and caricatured the German thinkers whom he had met; yet as a sower of ideas (even when the seeds had been borrowed across the Rhine), he plays a role second to none, not even to Fauriel or to Pierre Leroux, in the first half of the nineteenth century. The three should be examined in their intellectual relationship with Germany.

Quinet has likewise not yet been adequately treated, since Tronchon's thesis on *Herder en France* regrettably stops at Quinet's youth. Yet he judged Germany more shrewdly, after his youthful illusions and as early as 1830-40 (in *Allemagne-Italie*), than any of his contemporaries. An extensive work by Oscar Haac on Michelet and Germany has been promised. Hugo's vision of Germany (from *Le Rhin, Les Burgraves* to *L'Année terrible*) is an important subject which would justify an ampler treatment than Schiebries' Königsberg thesis of 1914. Nerval and Germany could profitably be treated anew, and a synthetical perspective of the place occupied by Germany and German literature in Sainte-Beuve's criticism would be of real use. Gobineau and Germany, a topic touched upon by Seillière and different from the wider Gobineau *in* Germany, should be a tempting subject for study, as well as the weighing of the German and French elements in Amiel's thought and prose.

The two greatest Franco-German themes in the second half of the nineteenth century are Taine and Germany and Renan and Germany.

Although England occupies more room in Taine's works than Germany, his intellectual affinities were with German thinkers, and the impact on him of Hegel, Schelling, Goethe was, with that of Spinoza, the most powerful of all. Taine was too systematic a traveler to observe much when he raced through western Germany; he went there to verify

his own *a priori* notes.[6] He remained prejudiced against German prose and against much pure literature in German—except Goethe's dramas and Heine. But the main task of his life was to attempt a synthesis of German metaphysics, English empiricism, and French insistence upon form.

As to Renan, Jean Pommier has clarified the extent of his knowledge of the German language; others have sketched, in a fragmentary manner as yet, the evolution of his attitude towards Germany. But the full and challenging study of Renan's relations with Herder, Hegelianism, Strauss, Feuerbach, of the influence of Germany on his political thought and on his life-long philosophical views, has not yet been undertaken. Yet Renan's originality lies primarily in the synthesis which he effected between the eighteenth century and the organic and often cloudy conception of a universe and God *im Werden* which he owed to German romanticism. The relations with Germany of Cherbuliez, the Swiss novelist, and of Challemel-Lacour, a pessimist who turned to political action, are minor but valuable adjacent fields of inquiry.

The line between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is hard to draw and is indeed illusory. The years which lapsed between 1871 and 1914 did not witness any noticeable weakening of German influence in France; for German romanticism was only then discovered by the French symbolists and their successors (another ambitious but important realm of study), and the name of Nietzsche was to haunt Frenchmen from Gide, Elie Faure, Suarès to Malraux, Mauriac, Thierry-Maulnier, and Georges Bataille. Geneviève Bianquis' little book on Nietzsche in France requires expansion and completion, to say the least. The subject of Barrès and Germany is second in importance only to that of Romain Rolland and Germany, which has been attempted repeatedly. A monograph by Renée Lang embracing Gide's relations with Germany, especially with Goethe and Nietzsche, has just appeared. The theme of Valéry and Goethe received an able treatment by Bémol in the *Revue de Littérature comparée*, XXI (1947), 382-403. Montherlant, Malraux, and Morand had contacts with German letters or the German spirit.

Giraudoux should naturally be envisaged from this point of view; in his student days he was a Germanic specialist and an enthusiastic discoverer of "romantic" Germany. His first dramatic attempt, *Siegfried*, sprang from his contribution to the *Mélanges* dedicated to his master, Andler. He had La Motte-Fouqué as a predecessor for his *Ondine*,

[6] One is often reminded when reading Taine, and other French writers, of Schlegel's remark to Benjamin Constant, recorded in the latter's diary for July 1804: "The French know so well everything they will say in every situation in life, that they are very kind indeed to condescend to carry on with a life which is all so clear to them beforehand; it must bore them like a tale twice repeated."

Hofmannsthal for his *Electre*, Kleist for his *Amphitryon 38* (Kleist's Alcmena was already a modern and a tragically solitary character, reflecting her creator's sorrowful inhibitions, while Giraudoux's "solitude" was rather related to his eager and uninhibited *donjuanisme*), and Hebbel for the finest of his plays, *Judith*. Hebbel had already turned Judith, the Biblical widow, into a virgin and deified virginity while reviling woman in Nietzschean tones; Giraudoux's heroine is, like his other *demi-vierges*, wise and foolish alternately, but neither innocent nor altogether guileless.

Surrealism may one day be explored in its German sources. Among the predecessors whom the surrealists have been busy assigning for their revolutionary turbulence is Lichtenberg, who was already keenly observant of dreams and described them with eighteenth-century clarity (André Breton prefaced a translation of his aphorisms in 1948), and Achim von Arnim, whose dream tales announced Kafka. The expansion of surrealism into German art and letters would constitute the other facet of such a study. As to existentialism, one may prophesy long controversies on the share to be granted to German phenomenologists and existentialists (Jaspers, Husserl, Heidegger) in the thought of Sartre, Camus, Marcel, and others.

Omitting the numerous studies still to be desired on the fame and influence of French writers in Germany (Stendhal, Gobineau, Augustin Thierry to whom Ranke late in his life confessed his debt, Balzac, Flaubert, Zola, etc.), we are struck by the very few monographs written as yet on the fame and influence of German writers in France. Goethe, studied by Baldensperger and Flora E. Ross in his French afterfame, and Schiller, exhaustively treated by Eggli, are naturally excepted. A mere enumeration of the most fertile subjects not yet attempted would include:

WINCKELMANN IN FRANCE. The famous "edle Einfalt und stille Grösse der Griechischen Statuen," first written in 1755, haunted French aesthetics at least as late as the Parnassian poets.

HERDER IN FRANCE. The history of Herder's influence should be taken up where Tronchon's volume stops and should be continued as late as Renan, even as late as several French nationalists, folklorists, and provincialists of the late nineteenth century. A recent French thesis by Rouché, in 1945, presented Herder as Darwin's precursor.

GERMAN MYSTICS IN FRANCE. There is need of attention to mystics from Jacob Boehme to Franz von Baader (exhaustively studied by Susini in a three-volume French work) and many other illuminists and occultists of more doubtful worth. Hamann has recently enjoyed some fame in France. Swedenborg and Kierkegaard often came to France through German interpreters.

NOVALIS IN FRANCE. On Novalis, the best studies (strangely enough, for he would seem to be as un-French as any thinker of Germany) are perhaps those of Spenlé (1903), Lichtenberger (1912), Tournoux (1914 and 1920, on the text and the language of Novalis), and more recently Besset on *La Pensée mystique de Novalis* (1945). J. Roos in 1947 presented a Sorbonne thesis, not yet published, on Novalis' mysticism, comparing it to that of Ballanche and Blake, as Jean Wahl had done earlier in an article in *Hermès* (June 1936). Novalis had been known intermittently to several nineteenth-century French writers; but his influence on French poetry has been especially marked since 1920.

HÖLDERLIN IN FRANCE. The discovery of Hölderlin came late, as it did in his own country; French admiration for him is now unreserved, as a volume published in 1943 for the centenary of his death testifies. His poems, which seem to stop suddenly on the verge of madness, have been repeatedly translated, and have inspired two important French poets of today, Pierre-Jean Jouve and Pierre Emmanuel.

HEINE IN FRANCE. This subject, obvious as it is, has not yet been embraced in its entirety. HOFFMANN IN FRANCE has only been explored in part. SCHOPENHAUER IN FRANCE has been mishandled in a poor French thesis and should receive new attention. HARTMANN, in connection with Laforgue and others, and his contribution to the literature of the unconscious since 1880, must some day be envisaged in substantial articles. WAGNER and his influence in France has been treated by R. Grange Woolley and more extensively by Kurt Jäckel in *Richard Wagner in der französischen Literatur* (Breslau, 1931). KAFKA and RILKE are subjects still too close to us to be embraced in adequate perspective.

The two greatest individual studies of German influences in France not yet adequately attempted would concern HEGEL and MARX. Rosca in 1928 treated Hegel's influence on Taine; but the subject should be approached by several workers in cooperation, and should range from about 1800 to Hegel's death, and then embrace the years 1831 to 1880 or thereabout. A third section should run through Bergsonism and the early twentieth century to the extraordinary Hegelian revival in France today, with Jean Wahl, Jean Hyppolite, Alexandre Kojève, and a marked Hegelian influence on novelists, critics, and essayists as well as on professional philosophers. The long history of Marx and Marxism in France should likewise be divided into time-segments; it would in most cases affect political and economic rather than literary history.

Comparative literature cannot be content with the consideration of the relations between two individuals of two countries, or even between two groups of writers. Thematology, or the study of a theme treated in several parallel literatures, is a perilous province, for it can lead to the

juxtaposition of disconnected remarks and to superficial conclusions on divergent national psychologies. But it can also prove fruitful when handled with skill and breadth of view. The myth of Prometheus in the romantic literatures of Germany,[7] France, and England could well be made the subject of one of the most rewarding and most "Faustian" studies on a common denominator of the three romanticisms. It would lead to the history of a mood or of an idea, that of Titanic revolt against the gods, which filled the century of the *Götterdämmerung*. Goethe, Wagner, Nietzsche, Jean Paul, as well as Vigny, Baudelaire, Leconte de Lisle, Rimbaud, Keats's *Hyperion*, Swinburne's *Atalanta*, Poe, Valéry's *Monsieur Teste*, the surrealists, and the existentialists, would have to be embraced in such a synthesis.[8] The study of other ancient myths, envisaged in their parallel posthumous life in two or more modern literatures, would be less ambitious, e.g., the myth of Iphigenia, of Electra, of Narcissus. The latter haunted Gide and Valéry, was lived by narcissists such as George and Rilke; a study of Narcissus would throw strange light on one of the universal aspects of symbolism. Even a more limited subject, such as the swan in Baudelaire, Mallarmé, and other French poets, and in their German contemporaries and successors, down to Rilke's poem in the *Neue Gedichte*, would well justify an article. Comparative literature must never stop at comparison; but it may sometimes start there.

More challenging inquiries may tempt mature scholars who dare range outside the limitations necessarily imposed on an apprentice's dissertation. One might bear on French and German personal or romantic novels, compared or contrasted. The confessions embodied in *Adolphe*, in Balzac's *Louis Lambert*, in Stendhal's "egotist" fiction, even in George Sand's youthful novels, are radically different from the self-exploration attempted in Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*, Jean Paul's *Titan*, Hölderlin's *Hyperion*, and Tieck's *Sternbald*, and by the heroes of Gutzkow, Spielhagen, Wilhelm Raabe. The difference is one of depth, of atmosphere, of psychology—the German characters being endowed with an infinite, at times an exasperating, "negative capability." It manifests itself chiefly in a difference in structure. The German novel, as conceived by Novalis and Schlegel, welcomes endless moral digressions and philosophical lessons, claims to espouse life itself through devious arabesques. Certain French critics, such as Jaloux and Béguin, who had been steeped in symbolism, have lately praised such novels to the skies. It is probable, however, that such admiration will

[7] A book by Oscar Walzel has treated the Prometheus symbol from Shaftesbury to Goethe (Munich, 1932). Another by K. Philip has followed Julian the Apostate, but in German literature alone (Leipzig, 1929).

[8] Some lineaments of such a study have been sketched by Michel Carrouges in *La Mystique du surhomme* (Paris, 1948).

remain exceptional in France. Even after Proust, Alain-Fournier, and Giraudoux, a novel to the French stands primarily in need of design. It must be dramatic and must include a minimum of narrative. Gide, in an oft-repeated remark, asserted that absence of design, and the preference granted to music, has been the bane of German fiction. Since there is no right and wrong in such conflicts of taste, the most enlightening undertaking would be an objective study of the French reception of, and reaction to, the German "romantic" novel. Thomas Mann is, with greater architectural power, the heir to those plastic, nebulous, philosophical, and overaesthetic novels of the German romantics.

But in another respect the German romantic movement triumphs easily over the French—it lived its loves, its sorrows, its anxieties with a heart-rending intensity which the French seldom approached. The lives of the German writers were even more romantic than their works. Musset, George Sand, Lamartine led, to be sure, stormy love lives. But there seems to be more sincerity, and less humor, in the pathetic adventures of Caroline Schlegel, of Bettina von Arnim, of other women attracted by the genius which then filled Germany, of Schleiermacher, of poor Hölderlin. A Frenchman is tempted to prefer even the crude paganism of the *Römische Elegien* to the mixture of erotic dissertation and ecstatic declarations (such as "I do not love you alone, but I love *die Weiblichkeit selbst,*" in Schlegel's *Lucinde)*—which strikes him as singularly devoid of irony in writers who made so much of irony. The fact remains that the German romantic poets, Hölderlin, Kleist, Lenau, gained from their inner *déchirement* an intense sincerity which does not, as so often with the French romantic poets, project a screen of rhetoric between themselves and the reader and does not labor over the direct sensation or feeling with an intellectual desire to universalize it. Only of Nerval among the French may it be said, as Grillparzer said of Lenau, who explored the abysses of insanity: "The blow which was aimed at his heart struck his head."

The parallel study of German and French romanticism could be pursued along many other paths. One would be the theme of sadism, broadly conceived, as Mario Praz conceived it in his comparative volume touching Shelley, Baudelaire, Swinburne, translated as *The Romantic Agony.* Baudelaire had many predecessors among the minor romantics of France and some, unknown to him, among the Germans. Novalis remarked in one of his *Fragmente* how astonishing it is that the long-standing association of *Wollust (volupté),*[9] religion, and cruelty should have left men unaware of their intimate kinship. He himself, as early as two months after his beloved Sophie's death, jotted down carefully in

[9] In the same *Fragmente,* Novalis recurs to the observation that it is strange "dass der eigentliche Grund der Grausamkeit Wollust ist."

his diary his "voluptuous reveries" and "sensuous tendencies" of the early morning. The theme of morbid and demonic cruelty was to haunt German artists, down to Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus.* Closely linked with it is the fascination with death. Again, from Novalis to Mann's *Tod in Venedig,* the German imagination has been more than "half in love with death." The French romantics have not been immune from such a pursuit of death, considered by Plato as the mark of the true philosopher; yet the treatment of the theme by Lamartine, Hugo, and Baudelaire, and even by Valéry and Malraux, is remote from "das wunderbare Sehnen dem Abgrund zu" of Hölderlin, Jean Paul, and Rilke. A study of this contrast would once more bring into strong relief the originality of each national psychology.[10]

Hellenism in Germany in the nineteenth century has received much attention, notably from Fritz Strich, Walther Rehm, and students of Goethe, Hölderlin, Platen. Here again, however, the broad viewpoint of a comparative scholar, contrasting the tyranny of Greece in Germany, as Miss Butler called it, with French romantic and Parnassian Hellenism, would offer a valuable contribution to the history of *Weltliteratur,* which Goethe called for in the last years of his life.

Other important topics might be similarly embraced in a spirit of supranational synthesis, for example: Napoleon and Napoleonic legend in France and Germany; the war of 1870 and, likewise, World War I in the two literatures; nationalism in French and in German letters; the theme of happiness (the forlorn child of literature!), as treated by some French writers of the Second Empire (Sully-Prudhomme, Cherbuliez), and more recently by Jacques Chardonne, who celebrated the bliss of domestic happiness and seems to have lost his mind over it, and by a happy few such as the Austrian Stifter in German (the latter, however, ended by taking his own life with a razor).

Finally, the theme of action in Balzac, Hugo, Malraux, Saint-Exupéry, often tinged in the moderns with Nietzschean colors, is more than paralleled by Goethe's vehement refusal of eternal bliss unless it offered new obstacles to overcome, with recurring formulations by Germans of their national task as "ein einziges Ringen mit dem Schicksal," down to the "Geist und Tat" movement and to Nazi literature.

In the present century, the parallels between the two literatures become very close, as the action of one upon the other is facilitated by multiplied means of information and even by the unwelcome but powerful contacts that wars establish between two cultures. George, Hofmannsthal, and Rilke acted as disseminators of French ideas and moods

[10] Only fragmentary studies seem to exist on the theme of death, such as those by Irene Betz on death in German impressionist poetry (Würzburg, 1937) and by Erna Küllner on the significance of death in Rilke (Münster, 1936).

among many Germans who never had to enter into contact with Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Rodin, Van Gogh, or Cézanne.[11] To be sure, much of what was thus borrowed by Germany from symbolist France might well have been taken directly from the earlier German romantics. But the prestige of what is both foreign and contemporary wields a peculiar fascination in cultural exchanges. As Rilke, himself both the most plastic and one of the most Germanic of poets, wrote on November 18, 1900 to Clara Westhoff, "we receive many of our riches only when they come to meet us borne by the voice of another."

Literature, in these exchanges, should not be considered as primary; French impressionism and postimpressionism had an important influence on many a German man of letters; Rilke and other writers in the German language have gone to Rodin rather than to the writers of France in their search for plastic purity.

Bergsonism, as it affected for example the concept of time in Rilke, would be worth exploring in its impact upon German literature. The creative criticism of Germans such as Gundolf, Bertram, Alfred Kerr, and Franz Brecht, radiating from a central personality outwards and throwing fitful flashes in all directions, has had many admirers among French critics dissatisfied with a traditional and exclusively analytical approach to genius. A favorite theme of French fiction after World War I, the adolescent in rebellion against his father, dear to Gide, Martin du Gard, Mauriac, and Cocteau, had predecessors not only in Dostoevsky but also in Gottfried Keller (*Der grüne Heinrich*). He has also many a younger brother in German fiction (Werfel's *Spiegelmensch,* Toller's *Die Wandlung,* Kaiser's *Die Koralle,* Wildgans' *Dies Irae).* There is a Frankfort thesis on the subject, *Die Gestalt des jungen Menschen im deutschen Roman der Nachkriegszeit,* by Paul Krantz, alias the German and French novelist Ernst Erich Noth.

The contacts between the literatures of France and Germany continued through the fateful years of World War II and the occupation of France. Future dissertations will scan the resistance literature of the French, the strange absence of hatred in Camus's *Lettres à un ami allemand* and in much of the postwar literature since 1944, the results achieved by scholars and critics[12] who, since 1930, have undertaken to reveal German romanticism to the French and who have succeeded in

[11] A curious, though possibly disappointing, search for a common denominator might attempt to trace whatever French elements are to be found in German writers of French origin and called by such pure French names as Chamisso, La Motte-Fouqué, Fontane, the jurist Savigny, the scientist Du Bois Reymond, the bilingual poet of Walloon origin Gerardy, etc.

[12] Jaloux, Béguin, and the forty or fifty contributors to the important number of the *Cahiers du Sud* devoted to German romanticism; the theses of Ayrault on Kleist, Minder on Tieck, Bertaux on Hölderin, Guignard and Garreau on Brentano.

popularizing in France those imperfect but strangely attractive poets and philosophers. It seems, as Michelet contended, as though the two countries which have often symbolized the division of Europe have also needed each other to discover their own originality and to exchange their complementary qualities. The French or German specialist would understand his subject more fully and deeply if he related it to the neighboring province which he has often considered as an uncharted or as an enemy land.

The comparative scholar's task is the most fecund of all in literary history, if fulfilled worthily—to establish relations between historians of literature, where relations exist between the authors themselves. In this task he is a creator too, bringing men and things into contact, as Hofmannsthal defines the creative instinct in a volume fittingly made up of German and French maxims *(Buch der Freunde)*: "Nicht: vieles zu kennen, aber: vieles miteinander in Berührung zu bringen, ist eine Vorstufe des Schöpferischen."

Yale University

ZANELLA, COLERIDGE, AND SHELLEY

A. Lytton Sells

IT IS a matter for regret that the Italian poets of the mid-nineteenth century are not more widely known in the English-speaking world. When, as sometimes happened, they were professors or critics as well as being poets, their verses displayed a firmness of structure and intellectual content which added to their interest. The work of a man like Carducci would have appealed to Matthew Arnold as fulfilling a condition which he required of the great poet—that he should give us thought, as well as beauty. For a time, until symbolism began to turn the current in another direction, the tendency of the age was towards a poetry which should be learned and thoughtful—a poetry which should draw inspiration from history and archaeology, and even, with discretion, from the natural sciences. In this respect the work of Zanella, Carducci, and Pascoli in Italy corresponds in some measure with the work of men like Leconte de Lisle and Sully Prudhomme in France. Yet, of the Italians we have mentioned, only Carducci is at all well known in England and America, while Zanella has hardly been heard of, except by professed students of Italian literature.

I

Nevertheless, on more than one count, Zanella was a very distinguished man. His poetic output, though not voluminous, was always on a high level of inspiration and technical skill. And the long-sustained interest in English literature which appears in his numerous translations of our poets[1] and in the critical writings of his later years[2] should arouse the curiosity of our critics and entitle him to our special regard. Zanella was perhaps the first to point out[3] that English poetry, which had for so long drawn inspiration from Italy, was beginning in the nineteenth century to repay the debt it had contracted in previous ages. It

[1] *Versioni poetiche* (Florence, 1887); new edition with preface by Ettore Romagnoli (1921), 2 vols.

[2] *I Paralleli letterari* (Verona, 1888).

[3] In the sketches of the English and French literatures which he gives in the introduction to his *Storia della letteratura italiana dalla metà del Settecento ai giorni nostri* (Milan, 1880).

is not the purpose of this essay to study Zanella's relations with English literature in general; the theme is a large one, which we are pursuing elsewhere. Our present object is only to examine the way in which the reading of one or two of our romantic lyrists can be traced in the work of the erudite Italian. But it is difficult to approach even this branch of his work without recalling the circumstances by which he became interested in English and American literature and found himself so far imbued with the spirit of our poetry as to allow very curious reminiscences of it to appear in his own work—in poems which are, as a whole, remarkable for their individual character, their classical restraint, and the content of thought which appears in nearly all of them.

Giacomo Zanella was born in 1820 at Chiampo, in a valley among the mountains to the west of Vicenza; in more than one poem he dwells on the pleasant home life he had known and on the country which he so loved as a child. Although he was destined to become a priest, there was nothing narrow about the education he received; at the *Seminario vescovile* in Vicenza, he was not only initiated into the literatures of Greece and Rome, but acquired from his master, Paolo Mistrorigo, a taste for making verse translations of foreign poets; Mistrorigo himself was an admired translator of Ovid and Horace. Pietro Giordani, who was in general charge of the literary side at the school, had translated Madame de Staël's famous treatise, *Sur la manière et l'utilité des traductions.*[4] We know that this treatise impressed Zanella, since he quotes from it in the preface of his *Versioni poetiche* and cites Madame de Staël's views in support of his own practice. No doubt in these early years he was primarily interested in the writers of Greece and Rome, and of Italy. Theology and philosophy must have occupied a good deal of his time. But he was already coming under English, or rather Scottish, influence. In the *Storia della letteratura italiana* which he published in 1880, he tells us that in youth he had revered the famous Hugh Blair, "gran maestro di rettorica," as a sure guide to literary beauty.[5] Perhaps also in these early days he read the version of *Ossian* which Melchior Cesarotti had published in Venice in the same year in which it had appeared in Edinburgh (1762) and the translation of *Fingal* which Cesarotti had issued in Padua in 1763.[6] For four centuries or more English poets and scholars had been visiting Venetia; Venice and Padua had become part of our literary tradition; and Zanella, a child of the Veneto, must have been sensitive to an intellectual atmosphere so favorable to England.

[4] See the preface, "Al Lettore," to the *Versioni poetiche* (1921 ed.), II, xliii.

[5] "Il dotto Ugo Blair, scozzese, gran maestro di rettorica, che noi nella nostra giovinezza abbiamo venerato come guida sicura al bello letterario, il Blair non dubita di collocare Ossian presso Omero." *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

[6] *Ibid.*

Entering the priesthood in 1843, he took his doctorate in philosophy at the University of Padua in 1847, and then went back as a master to his old school at Vicenza. But the year of revolutions was at hand. An ardent patriot, he made no secret of his sympathy with the cause of national independence. In 1850 his house was searched by the Austrian police; and, because he felt that his continued teaching at the school would be a source of embarrassment to his colleagues, he went into retirement for a time—a retirement which was to prove fruitful for his development both as a poet and as a scholar.

It enabled him to return with renewed zest to the study of the ancients and also to acquire some knowledge of modern languages. It was during this period, which extended from 1853 to 1857 (the year when he was appointed as a master at the Liceo in Venice), that he made a number of the verse translations which were to appear, many years later, in his *Versioni poetiche*.

To translate into Italian verse any specimens of poetry which happened to appeal to him was probably his method, or at least his practice, when learning a foreign language. He must have devoted a fair amount of time to the study of English; some though not all of his translations from Shelley, Longfellow, and others belong to this period. A little later, perhaps, he read *Paradise Lost* and meditated on the visit which the young Milton, during his sojourn in Italy, is supposed to have paid to Galileo Galilei at Arcetri. As Galileo had been professor at Padua, and as English scholars had been especially associated with the University of Padua from the fifteenth century to the seventeenth,[7] the subject would have a special interest for him. The interview between the great Italian and the great Englishman, with an imaginary conversation between them, is the subject of one of his best poems. At the same time he was beginning to inquire into the progress of English science. He was familiar with the *Origin of Species*, and we know from his correspondence that in 1864 he was "immersed" in the study of Lyell's *Geology*. One may conclude from such scattered data that, for some years prior to his appointment as professor of Italian literature at Padua in 1866,[8] Zanella had had a fair working knowledge of the English language and was sufficiently interested in our poets, preromantic and romantic, to translate a number of their shorter pieces. The *Versioni poetiche* might

[7] A. Lytton Sells, "Englishmen in Padua, from Chaucer to Shelley," *Durham University Journal*, XL (Dec. 1947).

[8] It was at Padua in 1869, in the home of the Countess Giuseppina Aganoor, that he made the acquaintance of two Scotsmen, the brothers Malcolm, who were then living in Venice. Zanella must have been greatly attracted to John Malcolm since, after his death, he dedicated to his memory one of the most moving and delicate of his sonnets. *Poesie*, con un saggio sul poeta di Arturo Graf (Florence, 1928), p. 483.

be expected to offer some clue to his taste, to his preferences, and—what is our principal object—to the authors who may have influenced him. Unfortunately a study of the translations is not only not helpful, but even in some respects disconcerting.

Of the three hundred and fifty duodecimo pages contained in the second volume of *Versioni poetiche*, the greater number are devoted to English and American poetry. The collection opens with a version of Gray's "Elegy"; there are single poems by Collins, Mayo, Bruton, Rogers, Campbell, Wolfe, Wordsworth, and Tennyson, two by Hood, four by Felicia Hemans, three by Burns, including "The Cotter's Saturday Night," six by Shelley, and eight by Longfellow. Like most Italians, Zanella was a warm admirer of Shelley, and the selection he makes is sufficiently discriminating: the "Hymn to Intellectual Beauty," the "Stanzas written in Dejection near Naples," the "Ode to the West Wind," "The Cloud," "The Skylark," and the "Ode to Night." From Wordsworth, however, he selects only "Michael," and from Tennyson "Dora." Longfellow is represented by translations of "Evangeline," "Miles Standish," "The Village Blacksmith," "Excelsior," "The Wreck of the Hesperus," "The Old Clock on the Stairs," "The Quadroon Girl," and "Afternoon in February," in that order.

A selection from which Coleridge, Keats, Byron, Clough, and Arnold, and, among American poets, Bryant, Whittier, Holmes, Emerson, Whitman, and Poe, are completely absent has no claim to be considered representative. It was probably not intended to be. What at first surprises us is not so much the poets who do not appear as some of those who do—and especially the choice Zanella makes from Wordsworth and Tennyson. One's first impression would be that when in doubt he went instinctively to narrative poetry. But the explanation is perhaps to be sought not in Zanella's taste, which appears to have been very good, but in the probability that, while he possessed a copy of Longfellow's *Poetical Works*[9] and therefore drew from them extensively, he translated the English poets, not from individual volumes except perhaps in the case of Shelley, but from one of the popular anthologies of modern English poetry which enjoyed wide circulation in the mid-nineteenth century. This would account for the fact that, while his selections from Longfellow are on the whole good, his choice of English poems seems to us rather uneven. "Michael" is a good poem and "Dora" was popular in the "selections." On the other hand, poets like Campbell, Rogers, and Mrs. Hemans would not, by critics of today, be accorded the place they occupy in the old anthologies.

[9] On the question of Longfellow, see G. Toffanin, "Zanella e Longfellow," *Rivista d'Italia*, Apr. 1920.

II

We do not know when Zanella first read Coleridge,[10] but it was probably during the four years of temporary retirement from teaching. There are no translations of Coleridge in the *Versioni poetiche*; yet an attentive reading of Zanella's original work shows, we think, a current of nature poetry drawn from Coleridge, mingled with a probably older current deriving from Marot and also perhaps from Burns and Wordsworth. The feeling for nature which all these poets expressed helped to enrich a sensibility already richly endowed, a sensibility nourished above all by the beautiful sub-Alpine scenery of his native valley.

The sonnet "Ad un Ruscello" (1850) gives a foretaste:

> Fresco ruscel, che dal muscoso sasso
> Precipiti tra i fiori e la verzura,
> E mormorando tristamente al basso
> Ratto dilegui per la valle oscura . . .

The theme has been dear to all nature poets since the Greek lyrists. It is present, of course, in Burns and well marked in "This lime-tree bower my prison," which Coleridge composed in June 1797. But "La Veglia" (1864), which belongs to the same year as the famous "Sopra una Conchiglia fossile," contains distinct reminiscences of more than one poem in Coleridge's *Sibylline Leaves*. True, like all of Zanella's poems, it is personal and original; but there are certain lines which could hardly have been written if the author had not recalled the memorable "Frost at Midnight" and perhaps also the concluding stanza of "Dejection":

> 'Tis midnight, but small thoughts have I of sleep:
> Full seldom may my friend such vigils keep.[11]

"Frost at Midnight," however, like Zanella's "Veglia," is a true "Vigil":

> The frost performs its secret ministry,
> Unhelped by any wind . . .
> Sea, hill, and wood,
> This populous village! Sea, and hill, and wood,
> With all the numberless goings on of life,
> Inaudible as dreams! The thin blue flame
> Lies on my low-burnt fire, and quivers not;
> Only that film, which fluttered on the grate,
> Still flutters there, the sole unquiet thing.[12]

---

[10] The fact that he knew the works of Coleridge appears to have escaped the attention of continental and of American critics, but Richard Garnett, who evidently detected it, makes a bare note of it in passing, in his *History of Italian Literature*.

[11] *Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge* (London, Warne, n.d.), p. 205.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 189.

Zanella, sitting alone and late in the kitchen of his house at Chiampo, can hear the night wind roaring in the chimney. But he too sees the trembling flame in the grate, and, as he turns around, watches the outline of the chairs projected in giant, dancing shadows on the opposite wall.[13]

Rugge notturno il vento
Fra l'ardue spire del camino e cala
Del tizzo semispento
L'ultima fiamma ad agitar coll'ala.

La tremebonda vampa
In fantastica danza i fluttuanti
Sedili aggira, e stampa
Sull'opposta parete ombre giganti.[14]

And now, for Coleridge, come crowding in the memories of childhood:

But O! how oft,
How oft, at school, with most believing mind,
Presageful, have I gazed upon the bars,
To watch that fluttering stranger! and as oft,
With unclosed lids, already had I dreamt
Of my sweet birth-place, and the old church-tower ...
So gazed I, till the soothing things I dreamt
Lulled me to sleep, and sleep prolonged my dreams.[15]

Zanella's poem follows the same rhythm, but again in a personal, original way.

Piú liete voci in questa
Stanza fanciullo udía, quando nel verno
Erami immensa festa
Cinger cogli altri il focolar paterno ...

Coleridge is thinking of his child sleeping beside him in his cradle. Zanella is thinking of the departed. Only the clock still lives, still ticks on:

... Ma tu già non taci,
Bronzo fedel, che accusi
Col tuo squillo immortal l'ore fungaci,[16]

E notte e dí rammenti
Che se al sonno mal vigili la testa
Inchinano i viventi,
L'universo non dorme e non si arresta.[17]

---

[13] A reminiscence of the dancing shadows in Longfellow's "Footsteps of Angels." See G. Toffanin, *loc. cit.*, and Tullia Franzi, *G. Zanella* (Turin, 1940), p. 19.

[14] "La Veglia," stanzas 1 and 2, *Poesie*, p. 46.

[15] "Frost at Midnight," pp. 189-190.

[16] Probably a reminiscence of Longfellow's "The Old Clock on the Stairs"; see G. Toffanin, *loc. cit.*

[17] "La Veglia," stanzas 5 to 7, p. 47.

If these are not reminiscences of a poem which he had assuredly read, and of which the concluding portions, so deeply in harmony with his own rustic Muse, are justly famous, it is certain that the rhythm of "Frost at Midnight" had entered into Zanella's sensibility:

> Therefore all seasons shall be sweet to thee,
> Whether the summer clothe the general earth
> With greenness, or the redbreast sit and sing
> Betwixt the tufts of snow on the bare branch
> Of mossy apple-tree, while the nigh thatch
> Smokes in the sun-thaw; whether the eve-drops fall
> Heard only in the trances of the blast,
> Or if the secret ministry of frost
> Shall hang them up in silent icicles,
> Quietly shining to the quiet Moon.

It is probable also that he had learned from Coleridge that a vigil affords a good subject for a meditative poem, and that the inducement to doze off into dreams may, as we shall see, lead on to something else.

For Coleridge, unfortunately, the inducement offered by the fireside was insufficient. In the summer of 1797, he tells us, in the note prefixed to "Kubla Khan" in 1816, he had been in ill health, "an anodyne had been prescribed," and he had fallen asleep at the moment when he was reading, in *Purchas his Pilgrims*, a description of the palace and pleasure gardens of Kubla Khan. He had composed two or three hundred lines of a poem in his sleep—or so he assures us. On coming to himself, he set down the verses that are preserved; but, as he was then interrupted, the later portions of what he had dreamed very speedily evaporated.

There is little doubt that this suggested to Zanella the introduction and even the general form of his vision of an ideal world—a vision which he significantly called "Il Sonno." Zanella could not of course be aware of all that we now, thanks to the researches of Professor John Livingston Lowes,[18] know about Coleridge's extraordinary fragment. He may not have been aware that the subterranean river had been suggested by Coleridge's reading, in Latin authors (strange as it may seem), of the river god Alpheus[19] who, enamored of Sicilian Arethusa, made his way under the Ionian Sea to emerge at the fountain Arethusa in Syracuse; but that, in the main, the "sacred river" was the Nile, with its source in the highlands of Abyssinia, as it had been described by James Bruce[20]—whence the "Abyssinian maid"—or, finally, that Cole-

[18] *The Road to Xanadu: a Study in the Ways of the Imagination* (London, 1928).

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 395.

[20] *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile* (Edinburgh, 1790), 5 vols. See Lowes, *op. cit.*, p. 370.

ridge had also read books about Kashmir.[21] But he may very well have known that the passage in *Purchas his Pilgrims* was derived from Marco Polo's *Milione*, and he may even have looked it up.[22] It would hardly assist him, except perhaps by suggesting the journey across the Euxine and the Caspian Sea, "verso la nova aurora"—though I think it far more likely that this part of "Il Sonno" was derived from Shelley.

Zanella's "Il Sonno" is a "vision," a kind of poetic composition which had not been uncommon in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in Italy. A close study of it, however, reveals something more visionary, even more spectral, than belongs to the Italian tradition. The poet, falling asleep, sees a procession of woods and pastures, lakes and mountains, slipping past him. He is in a boat, sailing down a river which, after a time, goes underground, bearing him towards "the foam of oblivion." Loosing his sword and helmet, he commits himself to the guidance of his shadowy escort; his hand lies idle. And with him, through this silent subterranean waterway, "which the Sun never explores," mankind is sailing "towards the new Dawn." The tyrant here feels no repulsion for the peasant rowing at his side; the man of war places his arm round the shoulders of the monk. All men are reconciled in brotherhood. And in this new land there is a temple dedicated "to the obscure heroes" who gave their thought and blood so that fraternity might reign among men. Such is the purport of the first eight stanzas.

"Il Sonno" opens in the manner of a song of Burns or one of the short "rational" lyrics of Coleridge.[23] The poet is reclining at the edge of a wood, lulled by the confused murmur of the bees, and at once his consciousness begins to swim, drunkenly; the printed letters on the page (of Coleridge, we presume), which lies open before him, lose their color and definition:

> Odo d'api pascenti
> Un confuso ronzio:
> Al bosco un mormorio
> Odo di chiusi venti.
> Ebbra l'anima nuota:
> Alla pupilla incerta
> Si scolora la nota
> Sulla pagina aperta.[24]

---

[21] Lowes, *op. cit.*, pp. 379-381.

[22] On the question of Purchas's influence on Coleridge, see Lowes, pp. 346-361.

[23] See Burns:

> "Among the trees where humming bees
> At buds and flowers were hinging, O";

or Coleridge:

> "This Sycamore, oft musical with bees,—
> Such tents the Patriarchs loved!"

[24] *Poesie*, p. 73.

Coleridge falling off into an opium dream, over a copy of *Purchas*—Zanella, gliding into an innocent and only imaginative dream (over a copy of Coleridge?)—it would be difficult for the Italian priest, without open reference, to allude more clearly to the strange experience from which the fragment of "Kubla Khan" had emerged, or more vividly to note the effects of opium on the consciousness: "Ebbra l'anima nuota."[25] What, meanwhile, had Zanella been reading? The following, we suggest:

> In Xanadu did Kubla Khan
> A stately pleasure-dome decree:
> Where Alph, the sacred river, ran
> Through caverns measureless to man
> Down to a sunless sea.

And a little further on:

> But O, that deep romantic chasm which slanted
> Down the green hill athwart a cedarn covert!
> A savage place! as holy and enchanted
> As e'er beneath a waning moon was haunted
> By woman wailing for her demon-lover! ...
> Five miles meandering with a mazy motion
> Through wood and dale the sacred river ran,
> Then reach'd the caverns measureless to man,
> And sank in tumult to a lifeless ocean ...

Zanella, a good man, will have nothing to do with women wailing for their demon-lovers—his dream will be of a better world in which the Kingdom of Heaven takes on the colors of nineteenth-century humanitarianism. So he writes:

> Veggo ombrose campagne
> E solitari seggi:
> Passan pastori e greggi
> Passan laghi e montagne.
> *Per insensibil china*
> *Entra sotterra un fiume,*
> Che lento mi trascina
> Sull'obliose spume.[26]

Here are the "caverns measureless to man."

Professor Carlo Calcaterra, in his commentary on Zanella, detects something unusual in this poem:

[25] Whether or not "Kubla Khan" was really the outcome of an opium dream may, in the light of recent research, appear uncertain or even doubtful. One has the feeling, however, that Zanella accepted Coleridge's account of its composition, and may have thought that the anodyne was opium; certain features of "Il Sonno," apart from Professor Calcaterra's impressions of it, are in harmony with this view.

[26] *Poesia*, p. 73.

La visione dello Zanella, piú che arcadica, è romantica, anzi dire per alcuni aspetti romanzesca, e ha una sua accensione immaginosa, in cui alcune strofe, bellissime, danno un singolar rilievo all'indefinito e all'inconscio. [We now know why.] È dello Zanella, cioè originale, quel senso di un tempo che fluisce perenne e ci porta obliosi sulle sue onde taciturne.[27]

Zanella continues as follows:

Dell'antro in sulla porta
Lascio l'elmo e lo scudo,
E mi commetto ignudo
A tenebrosa scorta.
Pende ignava la mano:
Vacillante e sopita
Ecco afferra un estrano
La lampa di mia vita.[28]

Here, if we are not mistaken, are reminiscences of one of Shelley's most magical poems, "Alastor." The hero, it will be recalled, after wandering through Arabia and "Cashmire," found himself "at length upon the lone Chorasmian shore." A little boat was there:

... the wanderer
Leaped in the boat, he spread his cloak aloft
On the bare mast, and took his lonely seat,
And felt the boat speed o'er the tranquil sea
Like a torn cloud before the hurricane ...

until

At midnight
The moon arose: and lo! the etherial cliffs
Of Caucasus, whose icy summits shone
Among the stars like sunlight, and around
Whose caverned base the whirlpools and the waves
Bursting and eddying irresistibly
Rage and resound for ever.—Who shall save?—
The boat fled on ...
A cavern there
Yawned, and amid its slant and winding depth
Ingulfed the rushing sea. The boat fled on
With unrelaxing speed ...
The boat pursued
The windings of the cavern. Daylight shone
At length upon that gloomy river's flow ...[29]

And here, in the heart of the Caucasus, the magic boat bears him *upstream* into a dell embowered in flowering trees. Yet even in this solitude he feels the presence of a companion.

---

[27] G. Zanella, *Poesie scelte*, con introduzione e note di C. Calcaterra (Torino, 1940), pp. 26-27.

[28] *Poesie*, p. 73.

[29] *Complete Poetical Works of P. B. Shelley*, ed. Thomas Hutchinson (Oxford, 1919), pp. 21-23: "Alastor," vv. 311-315, 351-358, 363-366, 369-371.

A spirit seemed
To stand beside him—clothed in no bright robes
Of shadowy silver or enshrining light.
.... only .... when his regard
Was raised by intense pensiveness, ... two eyes,
Two starry eyes, hung in the gloom of thought,
And seemed with their serene and azure smiles
To beckon him.[30]

This passage may well account for Zanella's "shadowy escort":

E mi commetto ignudo
A *tenebrosa scorta.*
Pende ignava la mano:
Vacillante e sopita
Ecco afferra un estrano
La lampa di mia vita.

Zanella may also have remembered the "Witch of Atlas," where Shelley, who also had evidently read "Kubla Khan" to some purpose, describes the witch's journey with Hermaphroditus down the mountain torrent:

And ever down the prone vale, like a cloud
Upon a stream of wind, the pinnace went ...
And down the earthquaking cataracts which shiver
Their snow-like waters into golden air,
Or under chasms unfathomable ever
Sepulchre them, till in their rage they tear
A subterranean portal for the river,
It fled ...[31]

The following stanza of "Il Sonno" is even more significant:

Pari alle morte onde
Che per cieco cammino[32]
Se il grido è ver, l'Eusino
Manda del Caspio all'onde,
Verso la nova aurora
Pe' silenti canali,
Che il Sol mai non esplora,
Nuotan meco i mortali.[33]

"Se il grido è ver." What report? We confess ourselves ignorant; but it might be no more than what Zanella had read in "Alastor" about a "cieco cammino" which apparently led in the other direction; and also—for here we obviously rejoin Coleridge—about the sacred river (not classic Alpheus after all!) which ran

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[31] Stanzas xli, xlii.
[32] A hidden way, like the cavern in "Alastor."
[33] *Poesie*, p. 74.

Through caverns measureless to man
Down to a sunless sea.

The filiation between the English and Italian poems is clear; but very different are the sequels. Coleridge's river

Sank in tumult to a lifeless ocean:
And 'mid this tumult Kubla heard from far
Ancestral voices prophesying war!

Whereupon the poet returns to the "dome of pleasure," and then, picking up a stray reminiscence of Bruce's exploration of the sources of the Nile, introduces the Abyssinian maid. There was some ground for Charles Lamb's fears regarding this poem, and for the amused comments of the *Edinburgh Review*, which, however, would have approved the consecutive logic of "Il Sonno." For there is no break in the continuity of the Italian poem. The dreamer and his companions emerge, as we have noted, into a world where, so far from hearing prophecies of war, all men dwell in peace and affection.

Rosea luce discende
Da tutto l'orizzonte;
Piú marina né monte
Il passo non contende.
Coronati di palma
Sugli opulenti piani,
Presso al ricolto, in calma
Meriggiano gli umani.[34]

There rises the temple of the unknown heroes. There white man and black man make pact of friendship, while far over the ocean rings a voice: "Christ has risen again." The poet awakens in confusion. Ah, why should the divine future, so clear in dreams, be now so obscure? Why should the sons of Adam be caught up again, as it were, in the old warfare, the old injustices, the old hatreds? Less easy is the way to the far-off shore for which we yearn; yet the wave of time is moving swiftly towards it; and, though oft driven back by the tempest, the solitary soul fares onwards toward "the other heaven."

Zanella is expressing here, as in others of his poems, those social aspirations which he shared with many nineteenth-century writers. Unlike Tennyson, he refused to accept the Darwinian hypothesis, but he believed that mankind was marching towards a better future. A few thinkers had their doubts; and yet such hopes, as Madame de Staël once truly remarked, sustain the soul of the estimable man.[35]

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

[35] "Que deviendrait l'être estimable que tant d'ennemis persécutent, si l'on voulait lui ôter l'espérance la plus religieuse qui soit sur la terre, les progrès futurs de l'espèce humaine?" *De la Littérature*, Discours préliminaire.

III

Meanwhile, there would seem to be a deeper and more abiding impression, more of true insight, in the beautiful ode, "Pel Taglio di un Bosco." This is not, as one might think, just a resumption of the theme of "Contre les Bûcherons de la Forest de Gastine," but a philosophical and even a prophetic poem. Standing alone on the naked hills of Montegaldo, near Vicenza, from which in 1869 the tall oak forest had been cleared, the poet feels already the tempest of the coming age roaring in his ears—sees, in this lowering nightfall, the past being flung down in ruins. So he appeals to the great oaks which had sheltered him as a child, but which now have vanished. However noisy and insolent the cry which condemns the faith of our fathers, he says, "you will not see me bend a servile knee" to the idol of modern materialism, or, "what I adored today, scoff at tomorrow"; but "in my heart, as in the days when I would sit at your feet, remain true to the ancient loves so pure and strong, the art of Italy and the Christian faith."[36] On the evening when he conceived this great poem, a nightfall of alarm but not of yielding or despair, Zanella was truly inspired; he was more than that, he was a seer, for he foresaw the awful consequences which modern atheism and materialism were to bring upon Europe.

"Il Sonno" was written before 1866, the year when Venetia became part of the Italian kingdom; it was not, however, published until 1886. "Pel Taglio di un Bosco" was probably written in 1869, before the Franco-Prussian War, during which Zanella's sympathies were strongly on the side of France. One poem of an earlier period still invites our attention. In "Le Ore della Notte" the translator of Shelley's "Ode to Night," which left so strong an impression on Ettore Romagnoli that he speaks of it twice with peculiar appreciation in his introduction to Zanella's *Versioni poetiche*,[37] might be supposed to have recalled a poet whom he always loved. But "Le Ore della Notte" is an original treatment of the theme. We see the hours descending silently in their dark sandals over the town:

> Con bruni sandali
> E taciturne
> Scendono, passano
> L'ore notturne . . .[38]

---

[36] "Ma nel cor saldi e schietti,
Come a' dí che sedeva al vostro piede,
Serbar gli antichi affetti,
L'arte d'Italia e la materna fede."
(*Poesie*, p. 145)

[37] I, xiii and xxxviii.

[38] *Poesie*, p. 25.

Smoke is going up from the roofs, little children repeat their "Ave"; and, as darkness falls, the light shines out from the windows of the mansion, reflected by the great mirrors within. And the poet, an invisible genie, gives us a glimpse of successive "interiors": the rich girl dressing for the ball, the poor girl bending over her work; the deserted street where a lamp shines dimly among the acacias; the café concert in the distant alley, where "loose-robed bacchantes" are singing "amid glasses and the clash of music";[39] the deserted wife leaning, listening, from the half-open window; the miser counting over his wealth in an ill-lit garret, unconscious of the presence of his young heir, grinning mischievously behind him; the gaming table, the ruined nobleman, and the plebeian moneylender. And now the Hyades and the Pleiades shine out more clearly in the hour that precedes the dawn; the astronomer yawns, shivers, and shakes the early dew from his hair; and the poem concludes with a young girl jumping up as the first ray of dawn shines on her curtain; the swallow twittering under the slates, the crow of a cock; and the town reawakening to its daily task.

Learning does not always stifle originality and may encourage it. We should guess, after reading "Le Ore della Notte," that Zanella had probably read *Le Diable boîteux*, or heard of the Spanish novel which was its source; but he does not exactly imitate either. The fact that his mind was stored with the poetry of the ancients and the moderns seems to have encouraged in him a more studied originality. When, as we have seen, he takes a hint from Coleridge or Shelley, he weaves it into a new poem, with a different pattern. And in most of his poems there is a richer content of thought, a closer texture, a firmer design than is usual in Coleridge or Shelley. The manifestations we have been studying are suggestions or reminiscences of poets very different from himself in character and method. The spontaneous flow of inspiration from which most of Shelley's poems proceeded, the reliance which Coleridge tended to place on states of trance or hypnosis, were foreign to his genius. His manner resembles that of the second romantic generation in France, and his mind belongs to the same *famille d'esprits*, as Sainte-Beuve would say, as that of Sully Prudhomme. He writes a poem only when he has a theme which appears serious, if not important, and his craftsmanship is always careful and finished.

The originality of the learned poet, when it is allied with the virginal

[39] These verses:

"Remoto vicolo
Empion di canti
Fra nappi e cembali
Scinte baccanti"

recall a passage in "Lines composed in a Concert-Room" of Coleridge, (pp. 162-163); but the similarity is fortuitous.

freshness which so much of Italian poetry possesses, has a quality particularly precious. If—as we believe to be true of Zanella—his inspiration be strong and pure, there are chances that he may be among the few of whom we may think as responding to the question we so often put to ourselves: "Who props, thou ask'st, in these bad days, my mind?"

Indiana University

LOS TRATOS DE ARGEL

JOAQUÍN CASALDUERO

AURELIO solo en escena da comienzo a *Los tratos de Argel*.[1] Un soliloquio. Las redondillas destacan al principio cada verso. El primero—"¡Triste y miserable estado!"—nos introduce inmediatamente en el lamento, cuyo desarrollo analítico mantiene ferreamente sujeto el inmenso volumen de la pasión. Aurelio, esclavo, se mueve con cadenas, y cada verso que parece ir a romper en su estallido de crescendo conmovedor la forma poética se somete a la redondilla para cerrarla. En el lamento no hay un acento desesperado; la queja es una toma de posesión consciente de la vida del cristiano en Argel, de lo que es el cautiverio: purgatorio en la vida, infierno en la tierra, mal sin segundo, estrecho sin salida, el mayor daño entre los daños; increíble necesidad, muerte palpable, trato mísero, padecer del cuerpo y del alma; piedra de toque de la paciencia, vida llena de sufrimientos, penitencia del hombre,

> ¡Cifra de cuanto dolor
> se reparte en los dolores!

Después de asomarnos a los martirios más grandes, de ponernos en el mismo borde de la catástrofe, de hacernos presenciar tormentos desgarradores, humillantes caídas, conductas heroicas en ese mundo formado por hombres y mujeres, niños y viejos, conducidos siempre por el amor puro y la voluntad indoblegable, por la luz de la gracia que ilumina tanta desolación, llegamos al final de la obra, la cual termina con la voz de Aurelio, ahora acompañado de tres esclavos, que prosternado en tierra eleva al Cielo en dos octavos su agradecimiento y su alegría. De la redondilla pasamos a la octava, del lamento inmenso, pero contenido, a una alegría infinita que desborda de todos los corazones, del cautivo encadenado al coral de los cuatro esclavos, que "echan todos las cadenas al suelo, e híncanse de rodillas." Al comienzo de la acción todas las esperanzas están puestas en la armada de Felipe II, la acción termina con el Bajá en su corte de crueldades y torturas brutales, pero

[1] La estética neoclásica no podía captar la unidad de acción de la obra, y la resolvía en un suceder episódico; además todo el acontecer al margen de la razón—sortilegios, figuras morales, milagros—le parecía un desatino. El siglo XIX, pasado el Romanticismo, veía sólo una serie de cuadros, que a veces apreciaba como escenas de costumbres.

por el mar avanza un navío. La tierra se llena de una suave alegría que levanta todos los corazones, es la nave de la limosna que se acerca. De un lado, la esperanza puesta en el Estado; de otro, la realidad de la misericordia redentorista. Esclavo-libre, lamento-acción de gracias.

Transmisión del texto

Como se ve la obra tiene juntamente un gran movimiento y una luminosa dirección. Pero el texto nos ha sido transmitido, cosa frecuente en el teatro español e inglés, de una manera lamentable. Un manuscrito, el utilizado por Sancha en 1784, la divide en cinco actos, otro, Rosell (1864), Schevill y Bonilla (1920), la presenta en cuatro. Lo más probable es que *Los tratos* tuviera cuatro actos, pero no es seguro, y aun en el último manuscrito se vacila en la agrupación y en el reparto de los personajes. Hay que desechar, pues, todo intento de conocer la forma de la que hoy aparece como la primera de las obras mayores de Cervantes, de esa creación que empieza situándose en el Mediterráneo islámico, partiendo de una experiencia personal histórico-religiosa, y que ha de terminar con el *Persiles*, entre luces nórdicas y en el centro del mundo occidental y católico—España, Roma: novela que arranca de la manera de concebir el católico poeta español el mundo y la humanidad. Si en la última obra, tan perfecta, su maestría le permite manejar con toda libertad y virtuosismo, los blancos y negros, la nieve y el fuego como fondo profundo y significativo de la realidad copiosa, en la primera obra que se conserva de Cervantes, y que para nosotros, hoy, ha de ser el primer testimonio de su creación, la pasión, el ardor religiosos, disponen de una forma poco flexible. Porque si el estado en que ha llegado hasta nosotros *Los tratos de Argel* no nos permite darnos cuenta de la forma exacta de la obra, en cambio quedan restos suficientes para que percibamos que estaba compuesta, más bien que con rigor, de una manera inflexible.

Así nos encontramos con cinco núcleos de octavas (en realidad los dos últimos forman uno solo, dividido por redondillas, versos sueltos y redondillas, en total 112 versos, que aíslan el tema final, realzado por el contraste con la crueldad de la otra parte de las octavas e introducido por las redondillas) en perfecta correspondencia temática: triunfo del alma heroica, esto es, decisión, y tormentos del mundo árabe. Al personaje Aurelio se le encomienda la lucha para alcanzar la victoria de la honestidad, y su desdoblamiento, Saavedra conduce la exposición histórico-religiosa. Dos escenas, que parecen hacer juego en su diabolismo, están escritas en versos con rima al medio. Por cierto que, aunque Moratín ya advirtió el uso de este verso, Rosell no se dió cuenta y corrigió sin sentido formal, y Schevill y Bonilla en su análisis de la versificación (VI, 164-165) los clasifican entre los versos sueltos.

La primera escena en tercetos de lo que es la jornada III en el último manuscrito publicado tiene 67 versos. Aurelio y Silvia se han encontrado por fin; ¡tanto amor rodeado de tanto sufrir! y los peligros a que están expuestos los amantes no terminan, ahora redoblan. Tienen que entregarse el uno al otro a la ardiente sensualidad de sus amos, Izuf y Zara. Ellos saben lo que es padecer de amor. Desde el hielo de su pureza, pueden sentir compasión hacia esos seres que se consumen en un fuego devorador, y la serie regular de tercetos se quiebra en el verso central, el 34:

AURELIO: ¡Oh pobre moro! SILVIA: ¡Oh desdichada mora!

Esta firmeza no da la sensación de algo sólido, sino más bien de rigidez, impresión que quizá sería la que produjera la obra, en la cual es sorprendente que se haya visto una serie inconexa de cuadros, pues lo que sentimos es que su evidente unidad espiritual ha sido manejada por una mano primeriza sin la soltura necesaria.

Dos temas: perder el alma, perder la vida

Aurelio expone lo que es la cautividad, particularizándola:

Pondérase mi dolor,
con decir, bañado en lloros,
que mi cuerpo está entre moros,
y el alma en poder de Amor.

Aurelio es un cautivo enamorado. Ha perdido la libertad y ha perdido a su amada, Silvia. El dolor del cautiverio que parecía insoportable, puede aumentarse; pero la causa de este tormento insufrible se transforma en auxilio y protección:

¡Valedme, Silvia, bien mío,
que si vos me dais ayuda,
de guerra más ardua y cruda
llevar la palma confío!

Silvia ha de protegerle del asedio de Zara, su ama y esposa de Izuf. Zara está enamorada de su esclavo. Le ley mahometana enfrente de la ley cristiana. Si su ley no impide abrasarse en el amor deshonesto, su matrimonio tampoco es un obstáculo. Fátima, la criada, se irrita, a la vez, ante le resistencia del cristiano y el rebajamiento de su ama, que suplica a quien debía mandar.

El esclavo encadenado y roto, hambriento y maltratado es el centro de un deseo incontenible. La belleza de los sentidos le asedia, la tentación sensual llega hasta a él en la forma conmovedora del ruego. La mirada y la voz, el gesto tienen promesas y peticiones, proximidades envolventes. El diálogo entre tanta resistencia y tanto rendimiento lo

presencia la pasión enteneblecedora de Fátima, con sacudidas de látigo, capaz de congregar todas las fuerzas mágicas de la tierra.

Esa calentura de la carne ofrece más que amor. Es un puente que al atravesarlo limará las cadenas, devolverá la dignidad del traje, terminará con el hambre y permitirá que empiece la vida regalada. El espectador se deja ganar por esa suave pendiente, todos caerían; hay un peligro más grande, el del hombre frívolo que incapaz de imaginarse la tentación decida que se ha de resistir y crea que él resistiría. De aquí, la tragedia de la soledad de Aurelio. Zara y Fátima se retiran, y la redondilla se transforma en octava. El verso largo nos traslada a una diferente imploración. El hombre débil, el cuerpo sin fuerzas, se dirige al Cielo:

> ¡Padre del cielo, en cuya fuerte diestra
> está el gobierno de la tierra y cielo;
> cuyo poder acá y allá se muestra
> con amoroso, justo y santo celo!
> Si tu luz, si tu mano no me adiestra
> a salir de este caos, temo y recelo
> que, como *el cuerpo* está en prisión esquiva,
> también *el alma ha de quedar cautiva.*

El endecasílabo se llena de un tono apasionado al suplicar a la "Virgen santísima María," a la "Virgen entre las vírgenes primera," a la "Virgen y Madre," que sea la intercesora para con Dios. Silvia es el reflejo terrestre de la Virgen y Madre celestiales. En la Virgen María se confía para que Dios derrame sobre el pecador toda su gracia. Así fortalecido, puede exclamar:

> Yo moriré, por lo que al alma toca,
> antes que hacer lo que mi ama quiere;
> firme he de estar cual bien fundada roca
> que en torno el viento, el mar combate y hiere.
> Que sea mi vida mucha, o que sea poca,
> importa poco; sólo el que bien muere,
> puede decir que tiene larga vida,
> y el que mal, una muerte sin medida.

Muerte-vida, el sentimiento generador de *La Numancia*, y, tal como se conserva hoy la Obra de Cervantes, el concepto cristiano informador del comienzo de su creación.

El cautiverio es una pena larga, un purgatorio, un infierno, un estrecho sin salida . . . es un estado en el cual para mejorar su situación corporal el hombre está siempre en peligro de perder el alma. Los padecimientos físicos inimaginables son, sin embargo, nada. O se es un héroe o se cae en la mayor abyección moral. No hay otra alternativa. El hombre de la virtud civilizada, el espectador de Madrid o Valencia o Sevilla tiene ante sus ojos la tortura de esa elección. Ser héroe o un ser vil, no hay término medio. La situación sería monstruosa (sería "ab-

surda" y "existencialista") pasar "de este hondo valle a la más alta cumbre," si la fe y la esperanza no supieran que la caridad divina mana siempre a raudales. Así, el tema del cautiverio al particularizarse—hombre enamorado—coloca en la posición más extrema la situación normal: tentación continua de mejorar de vida.

Al irse Aurelio, hay un cambio de escena completo, que para una mente moderna desde comienzos del siglo XVII va acompañado de un cambio de lugar. Pero el teatro del primer Barroco se desentiende hasta tal punto de la localización, que no sólo no se preocupa del escenario, sino que dejará a Lope la tarea de crear la palabra dramática con poder de representación. Lope por uno de esos misterios de la magia poética dota a la palabra de su primera capacidad dominadora de representación. Dice noche, bosque, camino, sombras, sol, palacio, plaza e inmediatamente la acción se aloja en un espacio de muerte o de alegría, de presentimientos o de felicidades y dolores presentes. Y las luces le siguen, llenando el ritmo de la acción de temporalidad y sentimiento de lo eterno. Con Lope el teatro en España adquiere ese poder que ya no perderá. Lo mismo acontece en Inglaterra y más tarde en Francia. Creo que esta es una de las grandes diferencias entre el verso dramático de la época anterior a Lope y el de la de Lope. A ella se une la concepción distinta del ritmo de la acción. En el teatro del XVII es muy frecuente ese cambio total de escena en la primera jornada (lugar, personajes y tema). Quizá es una de las características importantes por lo que toca al ritmo de la acción, y acaso haya que referirla a la nueva división de la Comedia en tres jornadas. De todas maneras, ese cambio en la época de Lope está puesto al servicio del movimiento de la acción y se utiliza para manejar y encauzar el interés, sin que el poeta sienta la necesidad de unir las dos escenas temáticamente.

Cervantes, por el contrario, inicia el segundo tema de la obra comenzando de nuevo (lo mismo hará en la novela, con resultados tan perturbadores para la crítica), de aquí que busque la continuidad no en la marcha de la acción, sino en la relación temática. Aparecen dos esclavos, Saavedra y Leonardo. El primero se lamenta (tercetos) de su estado, y el segundo le dice que quejarse es perder el tiempo, poniéndose como ejemplo de vida feliz en el cautiverio:

> A mi patrona tengo por amiga;
> trátame cual me ves; huelgo y paseo;
> 'cautivo soy' el que quisiere diga.

Saavedra le reprocha que haya caído tan bajo, y Leonardo responde que mejor es hablar de otra cosa. Saavedra es un desdoblamiento de Aurelio, pero no está enamorado; Leonardo tampoco está enamorado, y se ha dejado arrastrar por la tentación de una vida cómoda y fácil. Tenemos una variación de la primera escena: diálogo en lugar de monólogo, fla-

queza en lugar de resistencia. Podemos encontrar un contraste, pero es casi seguro que lo que le importaba al autor era disponer un enlace entre ambas escenas y sentirse libre para atacar el segundo tema. De una manera brusca continúa Leonardo:

> Déjate de eso y escucha de la guerra
> que el gran Filipo hace nueva cierta,
> y un poco la pasión de ti destierra.

Felipe II ha congregado un numeroso ejército en la dehesa Cantillana (Badajoz) y le ha pasado revista (13 de junio de 1580), nadie sabe cuál es el propósito de esa muestra. Al oír la notica, Saavedra exclama:

> Rompeos ya, cielos, y llovednos presto
> el librador de nuestra amarga guerra,
> si ya en el suelo no le tenéis presto.

Los manuales de literatura europea suelen dar una impresión falsa cuanda hablan del "Orientalismo" como tema romántico. No, el orientalismo se encuentra en todas las épocas. Sin recordar los períodos visigótico, románico o gótico, en el Renacimiento y en el Barroco se encuentra abundantemente, sobre todo en España. Lo que ocurre es que cada época lo utiliza según las necesidades de su propio mundo espiritual, el cual no sólo tiene una vivencia particular, sino una expresión correspondiente, y de acuerdo con esta experiencia espiritual y su expresión el tema orientalista, como todos los temas, cambia en cada época. En el Barroco español quizá el medio donde se da más sea el literario, y entre los escritores es posible que sea Cervantes el que lo emplea con un impulso más vital—porque la utilización de un tema puede obedecer a una necesidad creadora o simplemente a una corriente del gusto.

El tema orientalista lo encontramos a través de toda la Obra de Cervantes, a veces, como un contraste espiritual de dos civilizaciones—la islámica y la cristiana—otras, como un contraste social; por último, como el choque de dos fuerzas históricas, teniendo siempre en cuenta la raíz religiosa de esa diversificación y la superioridad del cristianismo.

Con Aurelio se representa el contraste espiritual, la idea de la Virtud, de la Honestidad. Hay mujeres árabes honestas, hay españoles deshonestos, pero precisamente en la medida que se acercan o se alejan del cristianismo. Quién sabe si la actitud de Cervantes hacia el pundonor y el lugar muy secundario que ocupa este tema en su Obra no se deberá a su obsesionante preocupación con el tema de la honestidad.

Con Saavedra—desdoblamiento de Aurelio—el orientalismo va a expresar la lucha de dos fuerzas históricas. Aurelio ha hablado primero en redondillas—lamento-monólogo, amor-diálogo—después en octavas estalla el movimiento heroico del alma que se confía a Dios. Se hace una pausa completa, pero se mantiene el endecasílabo; en tercetos hemos

oído el segundo lamento y el rebajamiento de Leonardo, luego éste habla de Felipe II y de sus ejércitos; al tomar la palabra Saavedra es el momento en que los tercetos vuelven a llenarse de pasión, de una pasión histórico-política.

SAAVEDRA. Cuando llegué cautivo y vi esta tierra
tan nombrada en el mundo, que en su seno
tantos piratas cubre, acoje y cierra,
no pude al llanto detener el freno,
que, a pesar mío, sin saber lo que era,
me vi el marchito rostro de agua lleno.

Son las primeras lágrimas vertidas sobre la historia de España. Saavedra no llora por él, llora por la historia de España:

Ofrecióse a mis ojos la ribera
y el monte donde el grande Carlos tuvo
levantada en el aire su bandera,
y el mar que tanto esfuerzo no sostuvo,
pues, movido de envidia de su gloria,
airado entonces más que nunca estuvo.
Estas cosas volviendo en mi memoria,
las lágrimas trujeron a los ojos,
forzados de desgracia tan notoria.

Luego, Saavedra continúa dirigiéndose a Felipe II,[2] suplicándole que tenga misericordia de tanto dolor—"poderoso señor, te están rogando vuelvas los ojos de misericordia"—y que siga el ejemplo del Emperador:

Haz, ¡oh buen Rey!, que sea por ti acabado
lo que con tanta audacia y valor tanto
fué por tu amado padre comenzado.

Felipe II era un hombre de estado demasiado grande para mezclar la misericordia con la política. En la época de Fernando el Católico y de Carlos V había un problema del Mediterráneo que se tenía que resolver con los turcos. Felipe II se encuentra con que, después de Lepanto, el dominio del Mediterráneo ya no es un problema oriental sino que está unido al dominio del Atlántico, de donde sale la Europa moderna. La

[2] La *Epístola* a Mateo Vázquez, formada con estos versos, me parece una falsificación del siglo XIX. Para el estudio de este problema, conviene observar que Cervantes usa la palabra real como bisílaba, tanto en *Los tratos* como en la *Elegía* al Cardenal Espinosa ("Si el ánimo real, si el soberano") y en las *Estancias* en honor de Pedro de Padilla ("El águila real la vieja y parda"). La *Epístola* en los versos de *Los tratos* que no ofrecen variante tiene a real como bisílaba, pero en una variante la introduce con sinéresis: *Tratos*, "Despierte en tu rëal pecho coraje." *Epístola*, "Despierte en tu real pecho el gran corage." Si todo fuera claro por lo que respecta a la *Epístola* y al descubrimiento del manuscrito, el uso de real quizá no designaría nada más que la presencia de otra mano, pero como ocurre lo contrario, creo que sin más datos no debe aceptarse que Cervantes la escribiera.

"cuestión de Oriente" la manejarán las potencias europeas para el dominio de Europa, esto es, del mundo. La lucha existe no entre los intereses de los cristianos y de los mahometanos, sino entro los de los católicos y de los protestantes para formar una Europa española y unida bajo el principio de autoridad o una Europa divida bajo el principio de libertad. La lucha era con Inglaterra, había que libertar a Irlanda y a los cautivos católicos ingleses, no por misericordia, sino por un ideal político: impedir la piratería en el Atlántico, que dirigida por Inglaterra y secundada por Holanda y Francia, era una amenaza para el Imperio español.[3] Gracias a la prudencia de Felipe II y al poder marítimo de España (alcanza el nivel máximo durante su reinado, a pesar del episodio desgraciado de la invasión de Inglaterra), el Imperio duró cuatro siglos. A Inglaterra le tenía reservado el destino la tarea de crear un Imperio fundado precisamente en la división: la gran novedad política del mundo moderno, que señala una ruptura completa respecto a la concepción de la Roma antigua y papal. Como Felipe II no tuvo éxito y sus sucesores no continuaron su política de sojuzgar a Inglaterra, ésta sojuzgó a España, apoderándose de la entrada del Mediterráneo.

Estas líneas no son una digresión histórico-política que intente aclarar la situación de España y de Europa durante el Barroco. Estas líneas son necesarias para aclarar la visión de Cervantes, quien ya nos da en *Los tratos* el mismo movimiento que en su Obra. De los cautivos españoles de Argel pasaremos a la cautiva española de Londres (*La española inglesa*), y expresará ese anhelo sentido por todo el orbe católico durante los primeros veinticinco años del siglo XVII de ver convertida a Inglaterra. En la obra dramática tenemos al principio, sobre el pedestal inmenso del sufrimiento, el deseo de que Felipe II acabe con el nido de piratas del Mediterráneo, pero al final se nos habla de los protestantes en Flandes. Son los luteranos, los que ofenden "tan sin vergüenza a su real corona." La piratería mahometana del Mediterráneo era un peso muerto que no representaba un peligro para el Estado; la piratería protestante del Atlántico era una actividad creadora que se oponía a la obra española.

Saavedra ha llenado la escena con el clamor de los quince mil cristianos aherrojados en los baños de Argel, y no se dirige a Dios, sino a Felipe II, cuyas poderosas armadas invoca. Al terminar, llega un muchacho, Sebastián, esclavo también, rebosando sus palabras indignada irritación. Aun trae en sus ojos el terrible espectáculo, terrible no porque hayan quemado a un hombre, es que le han hecho perecer injusta-

[3] Comp. Céspedes y Meneses: "Preveníase en aquesta sazón en la Coruña, en Lisboa y parte de Vizcaya la más potente armada que han visto nuestros siglos; magnánimo y piadoso remedio del católico Felipe contra las invasiones de la India y expugnación de Inglaterra, que las fomentaba."—*Colección selecta de antiguas novelas españolas*, ed. Emilio Cotarelo y Mori (Madrid, 1906), t. II (*El buen celo premiado*), p. 58.

mente, movidos por la venganza y el odio. A la visión histórico-política se une inmediatamente su secuencia: la justicia.

El siglo XIX, afortunadamente, se horrorizaba ante esas hogueras que encendía el hombre en nombre de la justicia y para hacer justicia. El sentido moral del siglo XIX es una conquista que no debería de perderse; pero esa conquista moral tiene que servirnos para horrorizarnos y avergonzarnos de la bestialidad del siglo XX y hacer que procuremos suprimirla, no es válida para enjuiciar las edades pasadas. Durante el Barroco arden las hogueras en todas partes, entre los protestantes, entre los católicos, y entre los mahometanos. El hombre de esa época no concibe todavía que se pueda hacer justicia de otro modo, por eso no es inmoral; hoy, dadas nuestras ideas morales, nos repugna el sistema penal y penitenciario actual y la manera como los grupos dirigentes de los distintos medios políticos reprimen los ataques de sus enemigos, tanto los del interior como los del exterior.

El siglo XIX naturalmente al admirar a Cervantes quería hacer de él un liberal. Tal transformación es imposible, por la sencilla razón de que el hombre liberal todavía no había sido inventado. Lo que importa no es señalar este anacronismo, lo grave es que con esa intención se interpreta mal el arte de Cervantes. Es un error suponer que un católico pueda alabar la libertad de conciencia, y, así, la frase de Ricote (*Quijote*, 1615) hay que leerla como una censura, como la peor desgracia que le puede suceder a un morisco: tener que salir de España y por si eso fuera poco no ser bien recibido nada más que donde hay libertad de conciencia y no se miran en delicadezas. Un católico exige la libertad de conciencia cuando reclama el derecho a existir él en otros medios religiosos, dispuesto siempre, como es natural, a suprimir encuanto pueda la libertad de los otros grupos.

Ya al comienzo de su Obra querían encontrar una actitud liberal en Cervantes, viendo en la narración de Sebastián un ataque contra los autos de fe. No hay tal cosa, es claro. A Cervantes no le indignan, porque no pueden indignarle, los autos de fe. Lo que cree es que los autos de fe católicos son justos, y que a los otros los enciende el espíritu de odio y de venganza. Sebastián cuenta cómo en represalia por haber quemado en Valencia a un morisco renegado, dedicado a la piratería, los de Argel acaban de quemar a un sacerdote valenciano. La narración es altamente patética, por eso está puesta en boca de un muchacho.

SEBASTIÁN. ¡ Oh cielos ! ¿ Qué es lo que he visto?
¡ Este sí que es pueblo *injusto*,
donde se tiene por gusto
matar los siervos de Cristo!
¡ Oh España, patria querida!
Mira cuál es nuestra suerte,
que, si allá das *justa* muerte,
quitan acá justa vida.

Estos versos preparan la narración, en la cual se destaca constantemente esta idea: justicia-inquisitorial, injusticia-mahometana; por eso está construída a base de oposiciones, Argel-España, venganza-justicia, dolor-fe, muerte-vida, suelo-cielo, mientras se pinta de una manera dramáticamente eficaz al Sacerdote camino del suplicio y luego en la hoguera. El relato se convierte en una gran exaltación martirial. La fortuna de la Contrarreforma: poder revivir hasta en el martirio la Iglesia primera y siempre la misma.

Saavedra cierra la narración, donde vuelve a aparecer el tema muerte-vida y la imploración a María como en las octavas de Aurelio, insistiendo en la nota dada por Sebastián:

> Muéstrase *allá la justica*
> en castigar la maldad;
> muestra *acá* la crueldad
> cuánto puede *la injusticia.*

Y la escena termina con una alabanza del sistema penal de la Inquisición.

Esta injusticia es *cifra* de todas las injusticias que sufren los cautivos, cuya liberación es un problema de España: del Estado (político), del hombre (caridad).

El cautiverio es un constante peligro de perder el alma (tema espiritual) y un constante peligro de perder la vida (tema histórico-político). Los dos temas, atravesando todos los obstáculos, dolores y caídas, son conducidos con un movimiento y dirección llenos de pasión al desenlace de la esperanza.

Dos culturas: (a) su diferencia social

La jornada segunda en las ediciones de 1864 y de 1920 empieza con Aurelio en escena acompañado de Izuf, su amo. El moro se lamenta (quintillas dobles) de haber comprado a una cristiana tan hermosa como cruel, y le pide a Aurelio que le ayude a rendirla. Aurelio promete hacerlo en cuanto la esclava llegue a la casa. Esta muchacha hermosa y pura es Silvia, la amada de Aurelio, quien, al retirarse Izuf, da a la estrofa un temblor conmovido:

> ¡ Qué es esto, cielos ! ¿ Qué he oído?
> ¿ Es mi Silvia ? ¿ Silvia ? ¿ Es cierto,
> es posible, ¡ oh hado incierto !
> que he de ver quien me ha tenido
> vivo en muerte, en vida muerto?

De Zara ya tuvo piedad, porque el cristiano sabe los tormentos terribles de la sensualidad; por Izuf tiene una sincera compasión, pues es natural que todo el que vea a Silvia se enamore de ella. El diálogo entre amo y esclavo es breve, y el soliloquio brevísimo. Esta escena mantiene en el

recuerdo la situación de Aurelio, ahora de peligro doble, y encauza el argumento. A la rápida exposición de la sensualidad y el amor, le sigue un diálogo muy breve también entre un corsario y dos mercaderes. Este diálogo (redondillas) prepara la escena de la venta de esclavos, y está lleno de actualidad. El poeta vuelca sobre la escena, con su notación pintoresca—"galima," obras muertas, árbol, entena, crujía, bogavante—toda la vida del Mediterráneo: las galeras de Nápoles, abarrotadas de mercancías y de avanzar lento, las naves piratas, ligeras y de maniobra fácil. En las galeras se guarda hasta el último momento la jerarquía social, la gente de los barcos corsarios es buena para todo, especialmente cuando se trata de huir. Al leer hoy la descripción con nuestra manera de pensar y de sér, es muy fácil ver en ella una censura; es posible que la haya, pero para mí está muy lejos de ser evidente. Cuando el corsario dice:

> Pero allá tiene la honra
> el cristiano en tal extremo,
> que asir en un trance el remo
> le parece que es deshonra,

el tono y la intención del corsario son claros, lo que no es tan claro es que tengamos que trasladar a Cervantes ese práctico punto de vista: un caballero puede preferir el cautiverio a mezclarse con la gente del remo.

Los mercaderes y el corsario hablan: aunque sólo sean mercaderes y corsarios es natural que estemos pendientes de lo que dicen y que haya que discutir sus ideas. Lo que importa, empero, es señalar la primera escena marítima en la Obra de Cervantes, tema que persistirá hasta su última novela, el *Persiles*. En el *Quijote* de 1615 hay una bella maniobra naval de caza, y de nada les sirve a los corsarios ni su ligereza ni su igualdad social en la huída: el poeta entonces quería hacer presa de los piratas.

(b) la división de la familia

La viveza de la descripción del corsario continúa cuando entra el pregonero a vender a una familia cristiana: padre y madre con dos hijos y un niño de pecho. El pregón sostiene la nota pintoresca y los detalles de la venta la aumentan. El trazo rápido, y aquí y allí una frase, un gesto pintorescos como fondo de una acción patéticamente desgarradora. El director de escena puede lograr un gran efecto dramático en la disposición de ese grupo familiar en medio del color deslumbrante y abigarrado de Argel. Hay un gran contraste de color y de movimiento: una actitud tan recogida, temerosa y azorada envuelta en el alborozo y bullicio de la multitud; la mirada de los mercaderes y la de la madre y los niños, ese cruce de alegría codiciosa y de dolor parado y contemplar atónito. Además, los ojos de los cristianos no sólo derraman dolor, hay

en su mirada una gran firmeza y seguridad. Como en *La Numancia*, para dar la nota patética Cervantes elige como instrumentos la madre y el niño, que tienen la misma calidad de sonido, pero con un tono diferente: el dolor natural y consciente de la madre consigue alturas indescriptibles cuando lo realza la inocente ignorancia infantil, mientras el padre lo subraya con su concentrada sobriedad.

Es claro que no convenía abusar de esta situación; pero si fué Cervantes, como parece, el que la encontró (acaso recordando *Medea*) en el Barroco, hay que conceder que fué un gran hallazgo; sumamente peligroso, es verdad; por eso admira más la sabiduría con que lo manejó el autor.

La mujer es la madre. Tener hijos, carne de la carne, y ver a esas criaturas, objeto de tanta solicitud, arrojadas al mundo del engaño y de la tribulación: "La ventura se te asconde, hijo, pues yo te parí." El parto hace desembocar la vida en el dolor, que la ignorancia del que la recibe aumenta:

> No conoces tu desdicha,
> aunque estás bien dentro de ella.

El hombre en ese misterioso círculo de placeres y penas. Amenazas y regalos tendiendo siempre la misma trampa, ocultando siempre lo mismo: la muerte. La madre, la donadora de la vida, sería únicamente el manantial sexual y oscuro de la muerte, si no pudiera transmitir el talismán del *Ave María*:

> Que esta Reina de bondad,
> de virtud y gracia llena,
> ha de limar tu cadena
> y volver tu libertad.

La madre implora de su hijo que nada en el mundo le "mueva a dejar a Cristo por seguir al pueblo moro." Y el muchachito se yergue con toda la luminosa verticalidad del mártir:

> En mí se verá, si puedo,
> y mi buen Jesús me ayuda,
> cómo en mi alma no muda
> la fe la promesa o miedo.

La familia se dispersa; del padre, la madre y el niño de pecho no volveremos a saber más. El autor se hace cargo de los dos muchachos. Hemos contemplado la primera tragedia: no sólo esclavos, sino separados. Quedan los dos muchachos sometidos a la presión constante de halagos y torturas.

La descripción del corsario persiste en el tema histórico-político (Saavedra), la venta de la familia es una variación del espiritual (Aurelio).

(c) la diferencia espiritual

El núcleo siguiente tiene lugar entre Izuf y Silvia; Izuf, Silvia y Zara; los tres personajes más un Moro (hablan en redondillas); por último, quedan Zara y Silvia solas, utilizan la redondilla y pasan al verso suelto. Es una escena espléndida de amor respetuoso y pasión incontenible, interrumpida por la entrada del Moro, que trae un mensaje del Rey (tema histórico-político): habiendo oído los preparativos de Felipe II, el Rey de Argel se alarma, pues, aunque los rumores son que se dirige a Portugal, teme que no sea una estratagema—

> Mas témese no sea maña,
> y es bien que tema su saña
> Argel, que le hace más mal.

Versos que nos comprueban que estamos ante una obra de arte. El que habla es un Rey moro con la preocupación de las gentes de su tierra. No se puede suponer que en el pensar político de Cervantes se concediera más importancia a Argel que al Imperio portugués y especialmente a la unidad de la Península. El Rey le manda a decir a Izuf que acuda a su Consejo; esta llamada tiene una gran importancia en la pintura del amor y gravita sobre el desenlace.

Silvia es una deliciosa figura pálida. El elenco femenino que creará Cervantes ha de ser tan extenso, complejo y variado; va a crear tantas formas para expresar la pureza y la lascivia, la frivolidad y la ignorancia, el sufrimiento y la alegría, el ideal y la realidad social noble e innoble, el mundo aristocrático y el plebeyo, la gracia divina y las fuerzas elementales de la naturaleza; sabrá Cervantes dotarlas de tal volumen, de tal movimiento, de tanta gracilidad y viveza, de tanto recogimiento y ardor, de tanto cinismo, de un color tan deslumbrante, de unas sombras tan sobrecogedoras, de un porte majestuoso, de un gesto trágico, de una desenvoltura humana, de suavidad, de ira, de unas lágrimas que queman o que tienen la fecundidad del dolor transformado en gozo, que hay que subrayar el valor estético y la emoción histórica de esa mujer, casada pero doncella, que por primera vez sale de las manos del poeta.

A Silvia se entregan todos los corazones, aquellos que al contemplarla se sienten elevados hasta la pureza y los que al verla caen arrastrados por la sensualidad. Silvia es un reflejo terrenal de la Virgen, por eso junto a María tenemos a Eva—naturaleza humana que atraerá los sentidos, pero imponiéndoles un respeto que no hace sino aumentar su tortura. Silvia alcanza en la Obra de Cervantes un desarollo extraordinariamente dramático, y con ella captará el poeta las exigencias más inflexiblemente tiránicas de la pureza y el cerco cruelmente punzante de la belleza sensual. Belleza divina y belleza humana, la idea y su

apariencia. Silvia es la primera forma de esta creación, primera y completa. Su belleza física enamora, y su habla comedida, su donaire, su gracia muestran que es bien nacida. Cervantes cuando tenga necesidad subrayará lo repugnante de la lascivia y el engaño temporal de los sentidos, pero junto a la lujuria que degrada está el respeto hacia la belleza, no ya la ideal sino la sensible. Ante la belleza sensual en un sér puro o impuro, podremos encontrar esas dos actitudes: el respeto o la degradación. La atracción que siente Izuf por Silvia es completamente sensual, sin embargo, aun arrastrado por ese impulso se mueve con el mayor respeto; respeto que incluso la belleza sensible inspira. Izuf recibirá un cruel castigo—a eso se expone quien trafica en belleza que se compra y rescata—pero su tormento espiritual tiene un origen elevado y de aquí que se le permita expresarse en un lenguaje cargado de figuras retóricas.

Con vos fortuna en su ley
no usa de nuevas leyes;
que esclavos se han visto reyes,
aunque vos sois más que rey.

Esa divina hermosura,
que es como la nieve escura,
que impide la luz del cielo.

Me ha hecho esclavo de mi esclava,
esclava que es mi señora.

Y aunque pudiera esperar
de ti un rescate crecido,
a tal término he venido,
que tú me has de rescatar.

La retórica de Cervantes en el primer Barroco mantiene su pasión en un punto equidistante entre finales del Gótico y del último Barroco, ni tiene de aquél el intrincado y afiligranado movimiento de infinito, ni tiene de éste la laberíntica arquitectura mental de una mecánica perfecta.

Izuf presenta la cautiva a su mujer Zara, quien reconoce su belleza y al preguntarle si es casada o doncella, contesta Silvia: "Casada soy y doncella." Esta virgen continúa:

El cielo me dió marido,
no para que lo gozase,
sino para que quedase
yo perdida y él perdido.

Llega el Moro con el mandato del Rey, se marcha Izuf, y ocupan la escena, solas, la mujer mahometana y la cristiana.

Dos mujeres enamoradas cara a cara; se miden inmediatamente. La mahometana es la señora circunstancial, la cristiana es la cautiva. Silvia, además, ignora lo cerca que está de su amado. Cervantes no quiere que perdamos en ese careo amoroso el choque de dos civilizaciones, en su

época, es lo mismo que decir dos religiones; pero también insiste en la encarnación femenina de esos dos mundos. Sin altivez, conservando no obstante su rango, la mora se dirige a Silvia: "Christiana, di," y Silvia contestará, sin humillación, pero aceptando su estado: "Señora." Zara comienza las preguntas, advirtiendo que es una mujer que habla a otra mujer: "Porque soy, cual tú, mujer." Apoyándose en ese elemento nivelador, valiéndose siempre de preguntas, entra en el terreno de las confidencias. Hablan de amor, ¡con qué cautela avanza! y no por temor a su interlocutora, sino aterrada de descubrir lo que su corazón le dice y sus ojos no quieren ver. Su voz tan anhelante, su pasión tan dolorida la van dibujando sobre la resignada serenidad de Silvia:

> Señora, soy de Granada,
> y de suerte ansí abatida,
> cual lo muestra el ser vendida
> a cada paso, y comprada.
> Dicen que fuí rica un tiempo,
> pero toda mi riqueza
> se ha vuelto en mayor pobreza
> y ha pasado con el tiempo.

Es claro que a Zara le corresponde preguntar, pero qué eficacia dramática, siempre dentro del cristianismo,[4] que sean los sentidos inquietos y perturbados los que llegan hasta nosotros en ese tono temblo-roso: ¿Has tenido enamorado deseo? ¿Fuiste bien querida? ¿Quisiste tú, o te quisieron primero? ¿Es joven? Y a la pasión abrasadora de cada pregunta le sucede una firme serenidad. Son dos amores. Son dos mujeres, dos civilizaciones. ¡Cómo la una se doblega vencida! ¡Con qué claridad triunfa la otra! La Edad Media no se ha cansado de representar frente a frente la gracia inclinada de la Sinagoga y la majestad erguida de la Iglesia. El Barroco hace lo mismo, pero con dos mujeres.

Zara está llegando a la pregunta aterradora, siempre paso a paso. El silencio entre cada pareja de pregunta y respuesta se va adensando más; el escenario y la sala, el teatro, se ha convertido por fin en una cueva de silencio. ¿Es cristiano? ¿Es pecado querer a un moro? ¿Está bien que una mora quiera a un cristiano? ¡Cómo se siente que el teatro es acción en diálogo! A la respuesta de la última pregunta sigue una exclamación que es un sollozo, y Zara entra en la narración. La onda cambia; ese breve oleaje de la redondilla con la espuma de la interrogación es susti-

[4] Comp. Jorge Manrique, *Coplas*:

> "qué diligencia tan viva
> tuviéramos cada hora,
> y tan presta,
> en componer *la cativa*,
> dejándonos *la señora*
> descompuesta."

tuído por el verso suelto: en lugar de la rima consonante circular la falta de rima. El verso se despoja de todo ornato para entregarse desnudo al acento; la voz se apodera del endecasílabo y lo conduce plegándolo a la relación, que adquiere un extraño ritmo dramático. A nosotros quizá nos sorprende más por estar acostumbrados a que estos relatos se hagan desde Lope generalmente en romance. Lope y los autores dramáticos del XVII obtienen grandes efectos armónicos[5] no sólo entre el contraste del ritmo del romance y el de otras estrofas, sino entre la rima asonante y la consonante. Una rima realza a la otra, pues si la consonante gana en brillantez en cambio la asonante hace valer su delicadeza y finura; sus tonos tienen menos sonoridad, rehaciéndose de esta pérdida con la suavidad que adquiere su color; no espiritualiza la materia pero le da una especie de húmeda irisación. A ese contraste hay que añadir el de la ausencia de rima. A finales del primer Barroco, Cervantes no dispone de esta maestría, aunque ha de conseguir grandes efectos con el verso suelto. Si en *La Numancia* se adueña con su apagado acorde del silencio de la acción, en el relato de Zara hace sobresalir con su desnudez el dramatismo del personaje. "Has de saber ¡oh Silvia! que estos días Partieron de este puerto, con buen tiempo, Doce bajeles, de corsarios todos, Y con próspero viento . . ." fueron a esconderse en las calas de Cerdeña, acechando "algún bajel de Génova o de España O de otra nación, con que no fuese Francia" (nota política que revela la situación del Mediterráneo, comp. el *Quijote* de 1605). Se levanta el mistral, se desata la furia de las olas, y en seguida aparece una galera azotada por el mar bravío. La lucha es imponente, las olas están empeñadas en hundirla, lo que el agua no arrasa el viento lo destroza, hasta que desmantelada, deshecha, consigue llegar a tierra, a la misma cala en donde se encuentran los corsarios que acaban lo que el temporal empezó:

> El robo, las riquezas, los cautivos
> Que los turcos hallaron en el seno
> De la triste galera, me ha contado
> Un cristiano que allí perdió la dulce
> Y amada libertad, para quitarla
> A quien quiere rendirse a su rendido.

El temporal es completamente verosímil, y así se debieron hacer muchas presas, logrando muchos cristianos salvar su vida del mar para perderla en la cautividad. Pero está incluído en el relato no por razones de verosimilitud, sino con un propósito dramático. ¡Con qué calma comienza la narración! ¡La formación de esos doce bajeles impelidos por un suave viento, cómo arriban a la isla con sus pequeñas ensenadas! Luego la galera abarrotada de mercancías, el temporal, el salvarse del mar y la

[5] Algún crítico del XIX no los ha sentido y ha desdeñado la versificación española. Su incapacidad se cita como autoridad en algún manual de literatura.

refriega con los corsarios. El contraste y la lucha sirviendo de fondo a la figura del cristiano que de repente llena todo el relato:

Este cristiano, Silvia, este cristiano,
Este cristiano es, Silvia, quien me tiene
Fuera del sér que a moras es debido,
Fuera de mi contento y alegría,
Fuera de todo gusto, y estoy fuera,
Que es lo peor, de todo mi sentido.

Los dos primeros versos tienen tal palpitar del corazón, la repetición es signo de tal desorden interior, que es necesario la avalancha de los cuatro "fuera" para mantener el equilibrio. El modelo de la fórmula estilística de la triple repetición quizá haya que buscarlo en el *Antiguo Testamento*. Compárese el dolor de David al recibir la noticia de la muerte de su hijo rebelde: "Fili mi Absalom, Absalom fili mi, fili mi" (II Samuel 19:4).

Zara está tan furiosamente desesperada como vencida:

Ansí que, Silvia hermana, como has dicho
Que al cristiano no es lícito dé gusto
En cosas del *amor a mora* alguna,
Tus razones me tienen ofendida,
Y con aquesas mesmas se defiende
Aurelio, a quien ha hecho tan cristiano
El cielo, para darme a mí la muerte.

Hasta qué punto el amor puede rendir queda captado en la aliteración. El Impresionismo nos hace sentir el deseo con todas sus profundidades estelares anhelantes de mirada, de tacto, de labios entreabiertos, con una exteriorización que es una interiorización, pues a medida que el cuerpo se hace más superficie la carne se ahonda más. El Barroco nos presenta el deseo, y hace del desmoronamiento una arquitectura. La narración está encuadrada ("¡Ay Silvia, cómo me ofendes y me lastimas temprano!" "Tus razones me tienen ofendida"), ha tenido ese fondo exterior del temporal y el cautiverio, además la presencia serena de Silvia, que en ese mismo momento se entera de la proximidad de su amado y esposo. Silvia oculta toda emoción, la oculta porque le conviene, pero el resultado es que frente al desbordamiento del deseo se levanta tranquila una dulce serenidad, y cuando dice que conoce a Aurelio, el propio nombre de ella se torna en labios de Zara sollozo y súplica: "¡Ay Silvia mía!" "¡oh Silvia, Silvia!" Zara termina con el mismo ruego de Izuf: que la ayude a conquistar a su amado. Silvia accede, como accedió Aurelio. La mora y la cristiana se retiran, y sale Aurelio.

Al dolor se le da la consistencia de la retórica

¡Cómo ha corrido, saltando, precipitándose, brillando, el torrente de la pasión de Zara entre las orillas serenas de Silvia! Y ahora sale Aure-

lio, la libertad del endecasílabo suelto queda sometida al terceto. Después del espectáculo que acabamos de presenciar, esa sumisión es más necesaria que nunca, porque Aurelio llega cargado con todo su dolor. No sólo el verso suelto queda engranado en tercetos, para expresar su dolor Aurelio le da la forma del tema de la Edad de Oro. Así *Los tratos de Argel*, tan actuales y personales, se vacían en un molde de retórica, que es como debía de ser. De pronto, una vida social e individual tan peligrosamente presente (aunque Cervantes no corrió el menor peligro, quien lo corre es el lector moderno) adquiere no una lejanía (eso es lo que hará el Romanticismo), sino una situación dentro de la condición de la naturaleza humana. El hombre descubre el oro y con él toda clase de explotaciones y engaños y además la guerra. Hé aquí que un tema de retórica suena con extraña modernidad, la modernidad que siempre tienen los conceptos morales pagano-cristianos.

Al leer *Los tratos*, aunque uno no quiera, se impone insistentemente la realidad del desdoblamiento Aurelio-Saavedra como una figuración poética autobiográfica. Saavedra nos daría el sentimiento histórico de Cervantes, que al pasar a otros personajes recibe toda clase de variaciones; Aurelio nos entregaría el sentimiento poético de la vida del escritor.

Aurelio está discurriendo sobre los males que ha traído el oro, el peor de todos la guerra:

> Y en la sangrienta guerra peligrosa,
> pudiendo con el filo de la espada
> acabar nuestra vida temerosa,
> la guardan de prisiones rodeada,
> por ver si prometemos, por libralla,
> nuestra pobre riqueza . . .

Cuántas veces quizá debió pensar el poeta que la modestísima situación económica de su familia quedaba para siempre comprometida con el cautiverio de su hermano y el suyo, y así otros muchos, que habían salido de España con los sueños de juventud de ser más y se veían por los azares de la vida reducidos a menos.

Todavía dentro del tema de la Edad de Oro, nos da dos notas del argumento de la comedia: "Porque esta gente . . . guardará por su Dios al interese," que anticipa la manera de conseguir su libertad, y, mientras recuerda el martirio del sacerdote valenciano, nos habla del peligro a que están expuestos los jóvenes: "El mancebo cristiano al torpe vicio es dedicado desta gente perra."

Se marcha, porque viene Izuf; éste en tercetos acentúa la nota de dolor. El Rey le ha honrado con un cargo en el supuesto ataque de Felipe II, pero el hombre enamorado no tiene vagar para otra cosa que su amor:

¡Oh Silvia, reina de la hermosura!
Por vos a los oficios doy de mano,
que pudieran honrarme y dar ventura.

Uno de los notables de la ciudad abandona todo en el momento en que el Estado se ve en situación tan crítica, porque el amor (lascivo) le tiene esclavizado. Sirviéndose de la aliteración como hizo Zara, dice Izuf su primer verso, que parece el comienzo de un soneto: "Quien con amor amargo se entretiene." Es la situación en que se encuentra el moro. En Argel, entre cautivos, en su traje oriental, esta figura expresa el alma del europeo occidental, por eso termina: "Tu beldad, Silvia, adoro aquí de hinojos."

Vuelve Aurelio y al ver a Izuf haciendo tales extremos, le incita a que no se desespere. Izuf no quiere consuelos, sino que le ayuden a conquistar a Silvia. Le pregunta a Aurelio si ya la ha visto, así se entera éste de que ha llegado a la casa. El diálogo es breve y está escrito en endecasílabos con rima al medio, versificación que prepara al oído para el diálogo entre Fátima y un demonio.

Dos civilizaciones y sus demonios

Antes de este diálogo, al marcharse los dos personajes, sale Fátima sola, y en octavas dispone la escena de hechicería. No tiene la dignidad hierática del conjuro necromántico de *La Numancia*; se impone al espectador por medio de la descripción y el juego escénico, apelando a las inclinaciones más elementales del espíritu supersticioso. Fátima aparece como una bruja con el cabello suelto y el cuerpo desceñido, el pie derecho descalzo, el rostro mirando al mar, el brazo rodeado de unas sartas de piedras mágicas, y va enumerando todos los adminículos pintorescos y extravagantes, allegados en circunstancias especiales, que van a servirle para someter a Aurelio. Al entrar en el conjuro, el sortilegio se hace aún más popular:

Rápida, ronca, run, raspe, riforme
Gandulandín, Clifet, Pantasilonte,
ladrante tragador, falso triforme,
herbárico, pestífero del monte . . .

Al acudir el demonio, lo primero que dice es:

La fuerza incontrastable de tus versos
y murmurios perversos me han traído
del reino del olvido, a obedecerte.

Cervantes en su primera obra está trabajando con una conciencia artística extraordinaria. Sabe cómo va a responder su público a esta

llamada a sus instintos superticiosos, que el exotismo oriental hace más poderosa.[6]

En lo que llamaremos la primera jornada, hemos visto la exposición de los dos temas de la obra, y en los dos temas el contraste entre el cristianismo y el islamismo. La segunda jornada dispone los dos temas en proporción distinta, pero equivalente. El amoroso es más largo que el político, éste, sin embargo, se refuerza con una fuerte nota patética. En la segunda jornada el contraste entre las dos civilizaciones se hace más violento y fuerte, y el genio artístico de Cervantes lo destaca en la escena mágica. Cada civilización tiene su demonio. Los hechizos nada pueden contra un cristiano; de nada aprovecha el trabajo de Fátima. A un cristiano se le vence en el terreno moral, apurándole con la necesidad, incitándole con la ocasión; hay que agotar su capacidad de paciencia (Job), de resistencia, y así debilitado presentarle una ocasión: (habla el demonio)

> . . . si estas dos vienen
> y con Aurelio tienen estrecheza,
> verás a su braveza derribada
> y en blandura tornada, y con sosiego
> regalarse en el fuego de Cupido.

La rima al medio nos ata interiormente; ya están las dos parejas reunidas y cruzadas en su propio fuego, libertad y esclavitud, pureza y sensualidad. Todos los deseos corren desbocados, la tentación redobla todos sus mirajes, a cualquier sitio que vuelva su mirada el hombre sólo encuentra el peligro. Vivir es eso: estar en peligro; siempre un Daniel en la cueva de los leones, el hombre con la armadura de la gracia divina dispuesto a la lucha. Cautivo-héroe, en la esclavitud un ser libre.

El conflicto dramático de la vida—la caridad

El poeta ha dispuesto la acción con magistral sabiduría, la tercera jornada nos presenta a todos los personajes en el ápice del conflicto, atormentados por la Necesidad y la Ocasión, cogidos en el torbellino de la vida. Subrayando el ritmo rápido, el movimiento se confía al endecasílabo (verso suelto, terceto, octava), que se interrumpe sólo una vez por medio de la redondilla.

Como el cauce está perfectamente trazado, la marcha veloz no se presta a ninguna confusión. Cada núcleo de la jornada tiene un gran sosiego en contraste con la agitación de las almas. La rapidez del ritmo no está en relación con el tiempo (por eso verso largo), no es que haya

[6] Si Moratín sólo hubiera manifestado su disgusto, sin estar de acuerdo con él, no tendríamos que reprocharle nada. Pero fuerte en su superioridad racionalista, habla de esta escena con un mal contenido irónico desdén. Su limitación neoclásica, tan vital y digna de admiración en su época, le impidió captar la profunda grandeza dramática que crea Cervantes.

que apresurarse; el movimiento lo que expresa es la presión a que están expuestos los cautivos: la necesidad les arroja hasta el límite extremo de la paciencia, cuando sin poder soportar más se acogen a cualquier ocasión por peligrosa e irrazonable que sea. Perder el alma, perder el cuerpo, perder el alma y el cuerpo, todo, todo menos continuar esa vida insufrible. Muchos caen o se pierden. Los que ofrecen menos resistencia—física o moral, es lo mismo—son, como es natural, los niños. En la escena no hay un paso del tiempo, porque en el cautiverio el tiempo no pasa. El primer minuto puede ser el momento decisivo y fatal, o después de larga condena, llevada con resignación ejemplar, en un instante la pacencia se agota. No se trata de una rapidez temporal, pues lo que importa es el grado de fortaleza espiritual, la cual nadie puede prever, menos que nadie el propio individuo. Donde el tiempo pasa es en la sala, los espectadores son los que tienen que apresurarse, no hay tiempo que perder. De un lado, la eternidad es un instante; enfrente, cada instante es una eternidad. El poeta quiere que de ese juego mortal brote la caridad en el pecho de los espectadores.

La huída: el rescate

La jornada comienza con este apurar la paciencia. Unos muchachillos moros gritan: ". . . non rescatar, non fugir; don Juan no venir; acá morir, perro, acá morir; don Juan no venir; acá morir." El estribillo pueril insistirá de una manera enloquecedora. Sobre la única esperanza cae tanta realidad. Un esclavo les hace caso, tiene que hacerles caso: "Bien decís, perros, bien decís, traidores; que si don Juan, el valeroso de Austria, gozara del vital amado aliento . . ." Y el Esclavo segundo (¿Saavedra?):

> Vendrá su hermano, el ínclito Filipo,
> el cual sin duda ya venido hubiera,
> si la cerviz indómita y erguida
> del luterano Flandes no ofendiese
> tan sin vergüenza a su real corona.

Los chicos insisten una vez más y el Esclavo 1° vuelve a contestarles: antes de morir, espera ver arder esa cueva de ladrones, y entonces el Esclavo 2°:

> Será nunca acabar si respondemos.
> Déjalos ya, Per Alvarez amigo;
> que ellos se cansarán; y dime agora
> si todavía piensas de huirte.

El tema histórico-político tiene esa vibración alucinante y en seguida nos introduce en la realidad, no tanto en una realidad social como moral: la sordidez del hombre. El Esclavo 1° cuenta que sus padres se han muerto y que un hermano que tiene, al heredar, no quiere gastar

nada de la hacienda para el rescate. Antes habíamos visto cuántas familias quedaban hundidas económicamente para siempre, ahora vemos lo contrario, cómo la avaricia se apodera del hombre, cómo no hay hermano para hermano. Así es la vida en España y en el siglo XVI; no es una nota realista, es lo opuesto, de acuerdo con el arte de su época. Es una nota general, por eso tan española y del siglo XVI: de todos los tiempos, de todos los lugares.

El Esclavo 1° va a escaparse y el 2° presenta todos los obstáculos de la huída. ¿Tiene comida para tan largo viaje? ¿Lleva zapatos? ¿Sabe el camino? ¿Podrá orientarse? Tendrá que andar de noche:

> ¿Por montañas, por riscos, por honduras
> te atreves a pasar en las tinieblas
> de la cerrada noche, sin camino
> ni senda que te guíe a donde quieres?
> ¡Oh libertad, y cuánto eres amada!
> Amigo dulce, el cielo santo haga
> salir con buen suceso tu trabajo;
> Dios te acompañe.

¡Que se escapen, que huyan! Es fácil pensarlo y decirlo, hacerlo está lleno de peligros. La empresa es tan irrealizable que ni se habla de la persecución. Cuando se va el Esclavo, le vemos irse a luchar con lo imposible, sólo un milagro puede salvarle. Uno sale con bien, miles perecen. Esta es la aterradora proporción, la aterradora fuerza dramática de la escena. Es fácil pensar y decir que un cautivo debe huir; era fácil, al leer la obra sentado cómodamente, no darse cuenta de la fuerza dramática de la representación. Tema histórico-político: perder la vida, el cuerpo. En la escena siguiente el tema amoroso: perder el alma.

El rescate: el hombre fuerte se vence a sí mismo

Aurelio y Silvia se presentan juntos. Dicen su felicidad: "Dádome ha la fortuna . . . Silvia mía . . . La gloria de mirarte y el contento" "Yo soy, mi bien, la bien afortunada." La amada declara que con la ayuda del cielo ha salvado la honestidad y que espera poder conservarla. Inmediatamente hablan de la situación en que se encuentran, el cruce amoroso, y de la necesidad de fingirse amables con Zara e Izuf. El placer de la proximidad lleva consigo el peligro de la perdición, pues el cerco de la pareja amorosa mahometana se hará sentir con más fuerza, y ellos mismos se verán arrastrados por la ternura; así, pues, urge pensar en el rescate:

> Yo escribiré a mi padre en el quebranto
> en que estamos los dos; tú, Silvia, puedes
> cerribir a los tuyos otro tanto.

Al retirarse, salen la Necesidad y la Ocasión dispuestas a someter a Aurelio. Estas figuras personifican y hacen que se vea con los ojos corporales al enemigo del cristiano, enemigo que actúa muy favorablemente en el cautiverio. Es una escena en la cual se exterioriza la vida de la conciencia. En realidad, incluso en el arte de hoy esa exteriorización va acompañada de una cierta artificiosidad, que se hace sentir también en Cervantes, aunque sus recursos técnicos, por lo que se refiere e este punto particular, estén muy cercanos a los de la comedia lopesca y calderoniana y al auto sacramental. Por otra parte los recursos escénicos (sin olvidar el adecuado estado de ánimo del espectador) pueden contrarrestar ventajosamente lo mécanico de este artificio.

Zara y Fátima le habían prometido el bienestar. ¡Cómo soportar por más tiempo tanta miseria y tanto sufrimiento! La Necesidad le carcome: padece hambre, no tiene zapatos, vestidos ni camisas, va sucio y roto, duerme en el suelo. Sería tan fácil que todo terminara, le apunta la Ocasión. Bastaría acceder a los deseos de Zara; tiene toda clase de excusas, además nadie ha de enterarse, además Zara es tan rica y tan hermosa. Los anillos se van estrechando cada vez más; Aurelio lucha, pero Necesidad y Ocasión se enroscan a su alma y a su cuerpo. Hay una tortura laocóntica. Aurelio está a punto de sucumbir, cuando el escenario se llena con el cuerpo de Zara. Ya no es una lucha interior, ni la vida de la conciencia; es un cuerpo hecho deseo, que chorreando sensualidad se pone al alcance de unos labios sedientos, de unas manos temblorosas. Cuando Aurelio le dice que no puede resistir más, es necesario oír la voz de Zara, ver su mirada, acompañar su gesto:

> Si eso ansí fuese, Aurelio, dichosísima
> sería mi ventura, y tú serías
> no menos venturoso, dulce Aurelio;
> y porque más despacio y más a solas
> me puedas descubrir tu pensamiento,
> sígueme agora, Aurelio, que se ofrece
> la ocasión de no estar Izuf en casa.
> AURELIO. Si seguiré, señora; que ya es tiempo
> de obedecerte, pues que soy tu esclavo.[7]

El enemigo del cristiano—siempre actuante, especialmente en el cautiverio—es la ocasión; ésta se personifica, la personificación se deshace: Izuf no está en casa. Creo que con estos versos la sensualidad toma posesión de la escena con la misma fuerza con que pueda hacerlo en el siglo XVII o en el XVIII. Y aún dice la Ocasión: "Entrémonos con

[7] El alma es esclava del cuerpo, de esa esclavitud es de la que ha de rescatarse. El concepto cristiano es el que da un sentido trascendente a la anécdota. De aquí el profundo significado, y siempre el mismo, de esas escenas de señoras y esclavos en la Obra de Cervantes.

Zara en su aposento." Se ve arder de deseo ese aposento; la imaginación más lúbrica ni puede sospechar lo que ocurre entre esas cuatro paredes que encierran a una mujer loca de ansia esperando a un amante que la seguía y que nunca llega, porque Aurelio felizmente no va. Mientras en el aposento se consume diabólicamente la insatisfacción, dice Aurelio:

> Aurelio, ¿dónde vas? ¿Para dó mueves
> el vagoroso paso? ¿Quién te guía?

Poco a poco el cristiano vence. Las espesas nubes de la tentación las rompe la luz de la gracia. El cristiano de todos los tiempos ha tenido la experiencia de la tentación y se ha ejercitado en expresarla, pero es evidente que Cervantes y su época la emplean como fondo que dé más realce a la voluntad:

> ¡Afuera, pensamiento mal nacido!
> ¡Que el lazo enredador de amor insano,
> de otro más limpio amor será rompido!
> ¡Cristiano soy y he de vivir cristiano;
> y, aunque a términos tristes conducido,
> dádivas o promesa, astucia o arte
> no harán que un punto de mi Dios me aparte!

El momento en que Aurelio se halla más conmovido—acaba de recobrar a su amada—es precisamente el momento oportuno para que le atormenten la Necesidad y la Ocasión. Basta, por lo que se refiere al conocimiento de la condición humana. Además, como siempre en el Barroco, que se incorpora activamente la Edad Media, la lucha entre los dos amores: honesto y deshonesto. El enredador, esto es, el que aprisiona y el que libera.

El hombre débil cae: el rescate

Aurelio triunfa. Hemos visto a un esclavo lanzarse a lo imposible, acabamos de ver a Aurelio al borde mismo de la perdición y en seguida vemos a un alma perdida. Lo que para la mente neoclásica no era nada más que una serie de escenas morales y para el costumbrismo decimonono una serie de cuadros de costumbres, tiene como era de esperar toda la fuga arquitectónica del Barroco.

De los dos niños (redondillas), uno se ha dejado seducir por la religión, por las costumbres del enemigo. La petulancia juvenil, con palabras y gestos recién aprendidos, hace de la caída algo aún más depravado. En la escena del esclavo se habló del rescate, Aurelio ha dicho a Silvia que tenían que pensar en ser rescatados; pero es ahora, ante el espectáculo de ese pobre niño degradado, cuando exclama:

¡ Oh cuán bien la limosna es empleada
en rescatar muchachos, que en sus pechos
no está la santa fe bien arraigada !
¡ Oh, si de hoy más, en caridad deshechos
se viesen los cristianos corazones,
y fuesen en el dar no tan estrechos,
para sacar de grillos y prisiones
al cristiano cativo, especialmente
a los niños de flacas intenciones !
Es esta santa obra ansí excelente,
que en ella sola están todas las obras
que *a cuerpo y alma* tocan juntamente :
al que rescatas, de perdido cobras ;
reduces a su patria el peregrino,
quítasle de cien mil y más zozobras :
de hambre que le aflige de contino,
de la sed insufrible, y de consejos
que procuran cerrarle el buen camino ;
de muchos y continos aparejos
que aquí el demonio tiende, con que toma
a muchachos cristianos y aún a viejos.

Con el niño se muestra la caída, y la escena patética sirve de punto de apoyo para implorar con la mayor emoción la misericordia. La caída del niño debe mover a compasión todos los corazones y hacer que de ellos mane la caridad. El rescate nos conduce desde el pecho duro que se niega a su obligación hasta ese horadar las capas más profundas para que brote el manantial del amor.

El consuelo del hombre

Se marcha Francisco, el muchacho que no ha renegado, y apenas le ha recomendado Aurelio que sobrelleve con paciencia la pérdida de su hermano, cuando sale Silvia de nuevo. Se dicen sólo cinco endecasílabos. Silvia le llama "dulce amado esposo," "caro Aurelio." Ella es "perfecto alivio" a los trabajos, él es "remedio" a los daños. Se enlazan los versos, se enlazan los brazos, y abrazados les sorprenden Zara e Izuf.

De la decepción de Zara no sabemos nada, pero su primer verso lo dice todo : "¡ Perra ! ¿ Y esto se sufre ante mis ojos ?" que se refuerza con el de Izuf : "¡ Perro traidor, esclavo ! ¿ Con la esclava ?" Zara en lugar de encontrar al hombre que deseaba ha encontrado a su marido ; se le escapan sus abrazos, pero le ve abrazado a otra. Es el punto máximo del dolor de la mahometana, por eso en cuanto se dejan persuadir por los cristianos y le aconseja a Izuf cómo engañar al Rey ; en cuanto ha cumplido su función, ella desaparece. Antes de estudiar el final de la jornada, conviene detenerse en el abrazo de Silvia, el cual parece claro que es la recompensa a Aurelio por su victoria, y así nos ayuda a captar su papel

frente a Zara en la escena pasada. Ya hemos observado que precisamente Aurelio se siente vencido y está a punto de caer cuando acaba de hablar a su amada. Hay que relacionar la presencia de Silvia con la fuerza de la tentación: en su estado sentimental la voluntad débil puede flaquear. Silvia está a su lado, Necesidad y Ocasión le rodean estrechamente. Aurelio tiene que luchar: o entregarse o resistir; Zara o Silvia. Al resistir, la gracia, que no abandona nunca al hombre, es el consuelo de Aurelio.

Ni Edad Media, ni psicología del siglo XIX. La Edad Media se mueve en un mundo de abstracciones (Voluntad, Necesidad, Ocasión, Tentación, Gracia) representadas a la vez con mucha imaginación y de manera muy naturalista; el siglo XIX, con un análisis que se hará cada vez más positivista, trata de observar el comportamiento del individuo y sus órganos en un cierto medio y en circunstancias particulares. El Barroco nos presenta a hombres y mujeres dentro de la condición general humana. Capta la naturaleza humana con la ayuda de la cultura greco-latina, que revitaliza al esquema cristiano. En el último Barroco se hace resaltar de manera intelectual ese esquema, lo cual da al arte de 162?-1660 una superficie aparentemente semejante a la Edad Media; es claro que hoy para una sensibilidad un poco adiestrada históricamente el engaño no dura ni un instante.

La situación se desenlaza declarando Aurelio que la desenvoltura de ellos no ha nacido de ocasiones lascivas, y afirma con palabras equívocas, equívocas para oídos lascivos:

> Y por habernos concedido entrambos
> aquello que pedía el uno al otro,
> en señal de contento, nos hallastes
> de aquel modo que vistes abrazados,
> sin manchar los honestos pensamientos.

Silvia lo confirma, e Izuf no tiene más remedio que exclamar:

> Entraos adentro, que por fuerza os creo;
> porque, si no os creyese, convendría
> castigar vuestro exceso con mil penas.

Al retirarse la pareja cristiana, Izuf dice a su mujer que ha perdido el favor del Rey y que éste le manda entregar a los dos cautivos. La lascivia de Zara se manifiesta por última vez, aconsejándole a Izuf que engañe al Rey y le diga que los cautivos no valen lo que se ha pagado por ellos.

En la jornada tercera se levanta la arquitectura de esas tres situaciones, en las cuales con un gran ritmo dramático se representan los daños del cuerpo y del alma para que de una manera ejemplar (con la ejemplaridad de todo el Barroco muy diferente del didactismo mede-

val) excitin la caridad cristiana; monedas de la limosna que salvan los cuerpos y las almas de los cautivos, sometidos al tráfico de la lujuria y del interés, es decir, de la lujuria del interés; esto es, del egoísmo personal y mezquino. Ante ese egoísmo no cabe nada más que la generosidad, la liberalidad. Cervantes continuará rondándole al tema, y llegará a escribir su maravillosa novela ejemplar, *El amante liberal.*

Perderse y salvarse

La cuarta y última jornada de las ediciones de 1864 y 1920 comienza con el cautivo que huyó. Ya está en el camino. Le ha sucedido lo que el otro esclavo (¿Saavedra?) había previsto. No tiene zapatos, ni vestidos, ni comida, está rendido y además perdido. Lo único que podría desear sería que volvieran a cogerle, si no fuera porque aún le mantiene la fe en la "Virgen bendita y bella." En ella se confía, a ella llama, Virgen y Estrella. Agotado, cae dormido. Cuando cierra los ojos, entra un león que muy manso se echa a su lado; otro cristiano llega, también huído de Argel. Su situación es la misma que la del que se ha dormido. Hambriento y roto, sin fuerzas para continuar la marcha; y, apenas se tiende, un morillo le ve y da la voz de alarma. "Cogen al cristiano, y, dándole de mojicones, se entran." El otro cautivo, al despertar, ve al león y con la mansa fiera como guía continúa el camino. La pareja—tan distinta de la relación paralelística medieval—compendia la huída. O se cae vencido, o sólo por milagro se salva. Conseguir escapar, con león o sin león, es un milagro. El milagro es algo tan excepcional como raro, pero en la muerte cierta es lo que ilumina al cristiano; la certidumbre de la gracia es lo que le mantiene en la fe. La realidad del manso león es en el siglo XVI una verdad en la que todos comulgan, por eso tienen ejemplos de ella:

> Y ya es caso averiguado
> que otro león ha llevado
> a la Goleta a un cautivo.

Los milagros son una verdad histórica, se cree en el emisario enviado por Dios bajo una forma u otra; además el que se salva entre los cientos y cientos que perecen se salva sólo por milagro. La escena del león leída por el que no tiene sentido histórico (sentido de que carecen muy frecuentemente los historiadores) parece pueril—el racionalismo de Moratín se sonrojaba sinceramente. Trasladándonos al ambiente moderno de la Contrarreforma, adquiere la grandiosidad heroica de la Biblia. El mundo científico consigue la misma grandiosidad, aunque de calidad diferente, rodeando al hombre de aparatos, máquinas e instrumentos en la selva de un laboratorio. Hemos de sentir este heroísmo y su belleza, hemos de ser capaces también de dar con la medida inmensa de ese

hombre derrotado a quien por medio de la fe se le comunica la fuerza del león. Y así continúa la marcha con paso seguro, con contenida energía, con los ojos brillantes, con el alma serena y alegre de quien ha vencido la muerte. La escena es bella e iluminadora, su significado es claro: sirviéndose del contraste de la pareja se cifra la huída.

Renegar, regenerarse: el Sacramento de la Penitencia

Los cautivos han hablado en liras de seis versos y en quintillas; la próxima pareja, *Pedro* y Saavedra, dialogan en tercetos y verso suelto. Esclavos hay que para mejorar su vida se dejan arrastrar por la tentación y pierden su alma. Aurelio es el ejemplo de la fortaleza que resiste. En la jornada anterior habíamos visto como Izuf tenía que entregar sus cautivos al Rey: le habían delatado. El delator es Pedro, su nombre nos está diciendo su destino: negar, renegar. El cambio de metro en el diálogo marca el cambio de tema. En los tercetos un aire triunfal, se triunfa en el mundo; en el verso suelto una intelectual penetración persuasiva que se hace sentimiento mientras adoctrina al alma en el Sacramento que sirve de fundamento, de roca viva, Pedro, a la Iglesia, el Sacramento de la Penitencia.

No se trata de un análisis psicológico a lo siglo XIX, sino de un proceso espiritual. El esclavo Pedro ha informado al Rey que Aurelio y Silvia son ricos y que pueden pagar un subido rescate, con esta información gana tres escudos de oro. "¡Gentil trama!" le dice Saavedra. Responde Pedro:

> Gentil o no gentil, si remediarme
> no puedo de otra suerte, y cada día
> he de dar mi jornal y sustentarme,
> ¿quieres que cate y guarde cortesía
> a quien puede pagar bien su rescate?

La palabra de Saavedra está llena de la bella y paciente comprensión del confesionario. No es un juez que fulmina la sentencia inapelable, es un sabio virtuoso, un jesuíta, cuyo paso, cuya voz, cuyo ritmo se mueve con una misericordia inagotable por el amplio cauce del conocimiento de la condición de la naturaleza humana—la naturaleza humana que parece tan variada al ignorante, pero que, para el que tiene experiencia del mundo, se repite siempre tan igual. Ante la alegría de Pedro por sus siete escudos (¿siete pecados?), pregunta Saavedra con calma:

> ¿Cómo cayeron, Pedro, en la celada
> los siete escudos hoy?

La anécdota será diferente, pero no hay sorpresa. La explicación de los tres primeros es recibida con irónica bondad. Se defiende Pedro. Vuelve a preguntar: "¿Los otros cuatro?" Ni sorpresa en el hecho en sí, ni en el

proceso. Primero una delación, después un engaño. Es el camino. Ya no hay ironía, dice Saavedra:

> ¡Desdichado de aquel que acaso topa
> contigo, Pedro; y tú más desdichado,
> que así codicias la cristiana ropa!

La bondad pierde su ironía y se entristece el ánimo; Pedro se defiende también ahora. No hay respuesta a su defensa. Este silencio mantiene en equilibrio el optimismo religioso de la gracia y el pesimismo por el pecado humano. "¿Qué piensas, Saavedra?" "Estoy pensando". Ha habido un silencio de meditación.

> Estoy pensando
> cómo se echa a perder aquí un cristiano,
> y más mientras va más empeorando.

Una falta, otra falta; también ahora se avanza paso a paso. Pedro, por fin, confiesa que está decidido a renegar, aunque sólo externamente, pues en su fuero interno seguirá siendo cristiano. Este es el engaño pueril del pecador, creer que el corazón y los labios pueden ir por vías distintas, pensar que las obras y la intención son independientes. No se puede ser desleal con las obras—la palabra—y leal con el sentimiento, ni lo contrario:

> Aquel que me negare ante los hombres,
> de mí será negado ante mi Padre;
> y el que ante ellos a mí me confesare,
> será de mí ayudado ante el eterno
> Padre mío.

Considerar estos versos cómo una cita académica es equivocado. La religiosidad de *Los tratos* hace aflorar la palabra del Evangelio con su atronadora amenaza, con su infinita bondad. La acción se eleva hasta la altura evangélica relacionando el renegar con la negación del pecador, como antes el martirio del Sacerdote con el sacrificio que cada día vive el sacerdote en la misa.[8] Pero no es una relación intelectual; está llena de vida y el Poeta hace sonar su verso con los registros más amplios y fervorosos.

El cautivo que quiere escapar corre todos los riesgos de morir en la empresa, aquel que pacta con el mal y trata de engañarse, creyendo que es un pacto pasajero, se engaña de verdad y pierde su alma. El cautivo debe tener los ojos puestos en la pasión y muerte de Cristo y fortalecer su ánimo por medio del Sacramento de la Penitencia, que no surte efecto si no va acompañado de los tres requisitos esenciales: contrición, con-

[8] Esta última relación se ve muy claramante en *Los cautivos de Argel*, refundición (1599?) de la comedia de Cervantes en estilo lopesco. Es interesante leer las dos obras.

fesión y satisfacción. Sólo así se gana la salvación. Saavedra ha convencido—intelectual y sentimentalmente—a Pedro, Pedro se arrepiente. Con esta confesión que pone al corazón en el único camino, el bueno, Cervantes llega al desenlace.

Desenlace. (a) Recapitulación de la vida en Argel: crueldad e interés

Sale el rey de Argel, él es cifra y compendio[9] de la vida de los cautivos y del trato que se les da: cruel e interesado. Manda apalear a Izuf, porque no le entrega de buena gana a sus esclavos, manda dar muerte al cautivo a quien cogieron huyendo. Mucha crueldad de parte del Rey, que se transforma en ira y la ira se transforma en un canto al español:

¡ No sé qué raza es esta de estos perros
cautivos españoles ! ¿ Quién se huye ?
Español. ¿ Quién no cura de los hierros ?
Español. ¿ Quién hurtando nos destruye ?
Español. ¿ Quién comete otros mil yerros ?
Español. Que en su pecho el cielo influye
un ánimo indomable, acelerado,
al bien y al mal contino aparejado.
Una virtud en ellos he notado:
que guardan su palabra sin reveses.

Carácter indómito e inquebrantable, sentido del honor. El enemigo lo reconoce. Fiado el Rey en el honor de los españoles, su interés hace que dé la libertad a Silvia y Aurelio, para que desde España le envíen el rescate doblado.

(b) Recapitulación de la vida en Argel: misericordia y agradecimiento

Un moro llega, anunciando que viene un navío, es el barco de la limosna. El agradecimiento, sin ninguna retórica ni sentimentalismo, al confirmar el niño Francisco la llegada de la nave, cita dos nombres, Fray Juan Gil, Fray Jorge de Olivar, dos mercedarios. Sus vidas caben en un verso:

¡ Oh caridad extraña ! ¡ Oh santo pecho !

La nave va llegando, la noticia va propagándose por la ciudad, la presencia de la misericordia hace surgir esclavos por todas partes. Uno: "¡Qué buen día, compañeros!" Otro: "No tengo bien, ni le espero." Un tercero: "Pues yo no me desespero." Francisco: "Dios nos ha de remediar, hermanos; mostrad buen pecho, que el Señor que nos ha hecho, no nos tiene de olvidar."

Los tres esclavos arrojan las cadenas al suelo y se arrodillan, a ellos

[9] Dramáticamente, el rey de Argel tiene la misma función que el rey cristiano: se le hace aparecer al final de la comedia para confiarle el desenlace, además es la personificación del mal; el cristiano tiene el mismo papel, pero es la imagen de Dios en la tierra.

se une Aurelio, y la obra termina en un gran coral en octavas. Es un canto de acción de gracias que se entona a la Virgen llena de misericordia, a la Madre de todas los que sufren y padecen:

> En vos, Virgen dulcísima María,
> entre Dios y los hombres medianera,
> de nuestro mar incierto cierta guía,
> Virgen entre las vírgenes primera:
> en vos, Virgen y Madre, en vos confía
> mi alma, que sin vos en nadie espera.

¿Qué se ha hecho de Juanico, el muchacho que renegó? ¿Qué les ha sucedido a sus padres? ¿Se rescata al niño Francisco y a Saavedra? ¿Qué será de Zara? ¿Qué hará Fátima con sus sortilegios? No son destinos individuales, sino, en general, la vida del cautivo en Argel, los tratos que recibe. Peligro de perder el alma, peligro de perder el cuerpo (relaciónese, para ver la diferencia, con la Edad Media), de parte de los cautivos; crueldad e interés de parte de los de Argel. La solución política, la única adecuada, no la permiten los protestantes, que tienen ocupada la atención de Felipe II, rey prudente, rey sabio. El deber de los cristianos es socorrer rápida y abundantemente a los que tienen su confianza puesta en el cielo: misericordia y agradecimiento.

Final

La actitud negativa del Neoclasicismo respecto a *Los tratos* se comprende e históricamente tenemos que justificarla, lo mismo que la deformadora influencia que ha ejercido el costumbrismo decimonono. La desorientación de la crítica de la primera mitad del siglo XX quizá pueda explicarse por la lenta adaptación de nuevos conceptos histórico-estéticos al estudio de la literatura. Hoy sería inexcusable el no saber ver una obra de arte, por eso podemos hacer surgir la claridad ordenadora y la relación orgánica de lo que aparecía deslabazado y confuso.

Jornada I. Exposición temática: 1° (a) lamento del cautivo, (b) peligro del cautiverio, (c) imploración a Dios. 2° (a) lamento, (c) imploración a Felipe II, (b) peligro.[10] Se invierte la versificación, 1° octendec., 2° endec-oct.

[10] La alteración del orden lógico en la correlación es muy frecuente en el Barroco. El propósito parece ser el de dar valor al elemento que se altera, en este caso la imploración; el hombre debe tener toda su confianza puesta en Dios, no en el Mundo. Compárese, por ejemplo, Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*. Dice Cleopatra, preparando su muerte: "... if (1) knife, (2) drugs, (3) serpents, have (1) edge, (3) sting, or (2) operation, I am safe." La crítica sobre Shakespeare, es claro, ha advertido la alteración, e incluso alguien la ha corregido para imponer al verso la correlación lógica. No sé si hay alguien, es posible, que se haya dado cuenta de que la alteración es intencionada: Shakespeare se propone destacar el instrumento de la muerte de Cleopatra. Que yo sepa, nadie ha observado que la alteración prepara en Cervantes el desenlace; no sé si se ha notado que la correla-

Jornada II. Comienzo de la acción, la peripecia: 1° entrecruzamiento de los amantes, 2° separación de la familia, 3° entrecruzamiento de los amantes (en 1° son los hombres, en 2° las mujeres, por fin, Aurelio e Izuf en tercetos sitúan su estado). 4° escenas de verso con rima al medio para expresar este entrecruzamiento, escena con el demonio. El número 4° nos prepara para el climax.

Jornada III. El conflicto, lucha del cristiano: 1° (a) huída, (b) triunfo, (c) caída. 2° recompensa del triunfo, que nos introduce en la jornada siguiente.

Jornada IV. Desenlace: 1° (a) perderse y salvarse, (b) pecado y confesión. 2° rescate y acción de gracias.

Los peligros del alma y los del cuerpo dan lugar al conflicto dramático, ordenado en su variedad por Aurelio (voluntad-amor) y Saavedra (inteligencia-doctrina). El tema histórico-político, enorme al comienzo de la obra, va disminuyendo su volumen a medida que el tema del rescate va aumentando el suyo, enorme al final de la obra. La vida de Argel es un hecho político que debe mover a caridad.

Si hubiéramos penetrado el sentido de *Los tratos* y si hubiéramos captado hasta cierto punto su forma, acaso pudiéramos detenernos a observar la manera cómo el Barroco se incorpora el mundo medieval y lo maneja. De un lado, se ha señalado la utilización de algunos temas: cuerpo y alma, cautiva y señora, el buen amor y el loco; de otro, se ha apuntado la identidad de ciertos recursos: el contraste de las dos leyes, la ejemplaridad, la relación paralelística.

Se puede afirmar, generalizando, que los motivos cristianos en la Edad Media tienen un carácter intelectual, mientras que en el Barroco adquieren un tono vital (a finales del Barroco vuelve a aparecer el aire intelectual, más con la calidad de abstracción algebraica—todavía la llamaban acción universal—que con la de abstracción dialéctica). Así, en lugar de una representación alegórica vemos a un cuerpo sufriendo y a un alma en peligro, a una esclava con su ama, al amor deshonesto y al honesto. Lo mismo ocurre con los procedimientos: en lugar de dos figuras alegóricas se contrastan dos mujeres; la Edad Media utiliza el ejemplo de una manera didáctica, el Barroco de una manera inspiradora

---

ción sentimental es la forma del desenlace de *Antony and Cleopatra*. En el conflicto de esta obra entre la lascivia masculina (poder) y la femenina (sensualidad), Shakespeare agrupa primero la muerte de los hombres, en este orden: (1) Enobarbus, (2) Eros, (3) Antony; después la muerte de las mujeres: (1) Iras, (3) Cleopatra, (2) Charmion. Los dos primeros en la correlación mueren de dolor, y hay una solución de continuidad de gran valor entre sus muertes y las que siguen. Cleopatra y Antony subrayan con la alteración su correspondencia. Eros se mata con la espada que tenía que ser el instrumento para matar a Antony, y Charmion también se mata, muere de la picadura de un aspid. Añadamos, como una digresión, que el triunfo de Octavio es la victoria de la unidad—¡ la Paz !—sobre la variedad de la lascivia—¡ la Guerra !

(dice Berganza, refiriéndose a la enseñanza de los jesuítas: "los animaban [a los muchachos] con ejemplos"); la relación paralelística medieval (virtud-vicio, vírgenes prudentes-locas) se torna en el Barroco en un desdoblamiento abarcador: Aurelio-Saavedra, los niños, los dos fugitivos.

La Edad Media para captar la vida y el espíritu tiene necesidad de reducirlos a un sistema, a un orden mental (basado principalmente en el número 3) y al expresar el orden está presentando la realidad de la vida. El Barroco hace florecer un orden riguroso de una manera desordenada, por eso la sensación de vida, de ritmo episódico, de deslumbramiento. Y debemos gozar con esa vida, con esa variedad, pero si queremos encontrar el sentido y la forma y no perdernos, en seguida tenemos que ver el orden. La *Divina Comedia,* una catedral gótica nos imponen inmediatamente el orden, bajo el cual sentimos todo el hervor de la vida. El *Quijote,* un templo barroco nos deslumbran con el desorden, tras el cual vemos un orden que le mantiene, que le da forma y sentido.

Los tratos es quizás la primera obra que se conserva de Cervantes. De su comedia a su última novela, el *Persiles,* tenemos el gran sentimiento de la Contrarreforma. La Obra de Cervantes queda incluída dentro del espléndido mundo católico de su época: amor y doctrina. Y, como el Barroco lo exige, es una apasionada imploración a la Virgen (esa nota de ternura y sentimiento gótico que se transforma en el Barroco en una alegre y ascendente esperanza), que se eleva en España con el recuerdo de Carlos V, la respetuosa admiración profunda hacia Felipe II y el cariño por Felipe III, los dos Felipes con los cuales se abarca la constante atención de Cervantes hacia el mundo mahometano: corsarios y moriscos.

New York University

EDMUND GAYTON ON DON QUIXOTE, ANDRÉS, AND JUAN HALDUDO

EDWARD M. WILSON

EDMUND Gayton's *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot*[1] was first published in 1654. A second edition, abbreviated, expurgated, and, in part, rewritten, appeared in 1768,[2] with the title of *Festivous Notes upon Don Quixote*, which had been the page heading of the original edition. The book has been consulted from time to time by English and American scholars because of its numerous allusions to the Elizabethan theater and to other aspects of the life of its time; the author's life is summarized in the *Dictionary of National Biography*; but, except for brief references in works by Ormsby, Fitzmaurice-Kelly, and Knowles,[3] the book has only been examined from the Cervantine point of view by Becker and the writer of this article.[4] The difficulty of Gayton's language, the rarity of the original edition, the burlesque nature of the commentary, the author's lack of any sympathy for either Don Quixote or Sancho Panza, and his tasteless parodies of what Cervantes intended seriously probably account for the fact that this folio has been almost unknown outside the British Isles and the United States, except to those who were particularly concerned with special aspects of English literature.

Both as a writer and as an interpreter, Gayton's faults are legion. He

[1] *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot.* By Edmund Gayton, Esq; London, Printed by William Hunt. MDCLIV.

[2] *Festivous Notes on the History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote.* First published by Edmund Gayton, Esq; in the year 1654. Revised, with corrections, alterations, and additions; and adapted to the modern translations of that celebrated work. To which is added, a copious index, by the editor . . . London. MDCCLXVIII. The editor was John Potter.

[3] James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, "Cervantes in England," *Proceedings of the British Academy* (1905-06), pp. 11-31. *The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote* . . . A translation with introduction and notes by John Ormsby (London, 1885), I, 3. Edwin B. Knowles, Jr., "Allusions to *Don Quixote* before 1660," *Philological Quarterly*, XX (1941), 573-586; and "Cervantes and English Literature," in *Cervantes Across the Centuries*, edited by A. Flores and M. J. Benardete (New York, 1947), pp. 269-271.

[4] Gustav Becker, *Die Aufnahme des Don Quijote in die englische Literatur* (*Palaestra*, XIII, Berlin, 1906) pp. 77-82. E. M. Wilson, "Cervantes and English Literature of the Seventeenth Century," *Bulletin Hispanique*, L (1948), 27-52.

is diffuse, obscure, insensitive, pornographic, sadistic; he not only parodies the serious parts of the novel, he also spoils, by overemphasis, the humorous parts. He was incapable of perceiving any admirable features in either Quixote or Sancho, and other characters in the novel are crudely caricatured without necessity or without excuse. Of Juana Gutiérrez he writes:

> *Ioan* was a great damp to the high thoughts of *Sancho*. For a man of his expectations to be depressed with a slut, a whore, or a fool (or it may be all at once in one) was an intollerable weight. A dung boat sunck in a shallow, where a wherry is to passe, lies so pest'lence unhappy, that neither it selfe can get forward, or any thing by it . . . [p. 26].

Of the *liciencado* in I, xix:

> He had no more Latine then the *Missale*, and that not in *Capite*, but by book. This fellow was to sing in Tone, and no matter for Accents, Quantities and Terminations . . . Take him out of his habits and set him in a Market, and no man but would prefer a Tinker before him, or give more for a Calfe, flesh for flesh, braines for braines. Alive he was in his cloths five pound a blow, but out of his clericall vestures, not worth so much as five sparrowes, which is halfe a farthing [p. 98].

And of Maritornes:

> *Mantornes* [*sic*] is the Monster of this Castle . . . shee was a sow of the largest breed, if you look upon her paps . . . Upward she was *Elephant* in head and ears, but not so docile, not so wise as that Creature, nor so serviceable . . . Her face was flat, and very much like an *Owles* . . . and her Nose adunck like an overgrown *Eagles* beake, her voice and that melodious birds, much alike. Her Belly of a capacity for a Cellar . . . [p. 72].

The quotations are disagreeable, but they give some idea of the general level of Gayton's humor. He identified the comic with the deformed and the degenerate. Like most men of his day, he looked at *Don Quixote* as merely a burlesque; today the burlesque part of the book has lost some of its interest and modern readers sometimes tend to take it too seriously. Gayton had one advantage that no critic of today can have: he wrote in the seventeenth century. Perhaps in portions of his commentary, despite its defects, we may find observations on some details of the *Quixote* that are not altogether irrelevant to our own interpretations.

If proof is needed that Gayton sometimes saw the point of what Cervantes wrote, his remarks upon the Cardenio story can supply it. In the wretched verse paraphrase of Cardenio's narration, Gayton made him say (p. 164):

> Short of *Luscinda* in my love,
> My resolution not so high
> (More like a spouse in modesty)
> A coward too, in fine I prove.

Later on he is called "tame Cardenio" (p. 176), and finally, when Gayton comments on the meeting between Cardenio and Dorotea, we read:

> Cardenio *taking her by the hand, said at last, you are daughter to the rich Cleonardo.*[5] I had thought *Cardenio* would never have been knowne; but now he will disclose himselfe, which he might easily doe, for he had scarce a rag to his taile, and gives her the naked truth, that he was that tame piece of flesh, who stood more like the Arras, then the Tapestry it selfe, while a perjured friend, made bold with his Lady before his face. *Dorothaeas* managery of her matters, was farre more ingenious and commendable, who was not a thorough loser, she got what was to be got, and though she lost the Principall, shee had good consideration. What hath *Cardenio* to excuse himselfe from the extreame scarre of a Coward? who having his hand on his hilt, and plac'd as in ambuscado for the Stratagem of revenge, expected the word from his Ladies dying groane. Her Ponyard must whiffle to his Toledo . . . [p. 177].

Are not these words a remarkable anticipation of Don Salvador de Madariaga's chapter on *Cardenio o la cobardía*?[6]

Two recent writers who have studied the influence of Cervantes in seventeenth-century France have noticed how frequently the name and figure of Don Quixote were associated with attacks on the overweening pride of Spaniards, attacks that took the form of rodomontades.[7] It is of course obvious that to see no more in Don Quixote than such a figure is to be unjust to Cervantes. But Mr. A. A. Parker in a recent essay has pointed out that Don Quixote had certain faults, of which "an immeasurable self-conceit" was one.[8] The fact that there was much that was noble in him does not mean that Cervantes meant him to be entirely admirable. The rodomontade-Quixote can be found occasionally in England.[9] His presence in Gayton may be looked at as one more example of

---

[5] "Tomó primero la mano Cardenio, diciendo:—En fin, señora, ¿que tú eres la hermosa Dorotea, la hija única del rico Clenardo?" I, xxix.

[6] Salvador de Madariaga, *Guía del Lector del "Quijote": Ensayo psicológico sobre el "Quijote"* (Madrid, 1926), pp. 96-110.

[7] Esther J. Crooks, *The Influence of Cervantes in France in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore, 1931), pp. 36, 81, 82, 83, 84, 93, 97, 99, 129, 133; Maurice Bardon, *"Don Quichotte" en France au XVII^e^ et au XVIII^e^ Siècle 1605-1815* (Paris, 1931), I, 2-3, 20, 81, 170 ff., 178 ff., 192, 193, 242, etc.

[8] A. A. Parker, "Don Quixote and the Relativity of Truth," *Dublin Review*, CCXX (1947), 28-37. The phrase quoted is on p. 34.

[9] In Massinger's *The Picture* (II, 1) the buffoon Hilario comes in disguised "in antic armour, with long white hair and beard" to cheer his mistress with an account of her husband's fortunes. In the course of his narration he says:

> "No more words.
> In the camp we use no pens, but write with swords:
> Yet, as I am enjoin'd, by word of mouth
> I will proclaim his deeds from north to south;
> But tremble not, while I relate the wonder,
> Though my eyes like lightning shine, and my voice thunder."

After his imposture has been discovered, the servant Corisca mocks him and calls him "dear Don Quixote." See Maurice Chelli, *Étude sur la collaboration de Massinger avec Fletcher et son groupe* (Paris, 1926), pp. 214, 220.

Gayton's lack of sensitiveness; but there is the possibility that Cervantes had given the English author some reason to think that Don Quixote was sometimes boastful in his speech. At least that is my impression when I read the fourth, fifth, and thirty-first chapters of Part I of *Don Quixote*.

The encounter with Andrés during Quixote's first sally leaves the reader disquieted. Cervantes shows us a farmer who maltreats a shepherd boy; Quixote arrests the infliction of the punishment, but his action is futile because, as soon as his back is turned, the farmer continues to beat the boy, although he had promised that he would let him go. The events are clear enough; how are they to be interpreted? Obviously there are wrongs on both sides. Andrés does not deny that he has neglected his duty as a servant ("No lo haré otra vez, señor mío; por la pasión de Dios que no lo haré otra vez."); Haldudo does not deny that he owes Andrés his pay ("Respondió el medroso villano que para el paso en que estaba . . . no era [el sueldo] tantos reales"). Both clearly are in the wrong. The boy is some fifteen years old; schoolboys at that time were often brutally beaten—"la letra con sangre entra"[10]—and few thought of reproving the custom. Is Cervantes trying to enlist the reader's sympathy for Andrés? Or is the beating merely an opportunity to make Don Quixote act?

Later in Part I of *Don Quixote* (I, xxxi), Andrés humiliates Don Quixote by telling him publicly of the subsequent course of the affair and reproaching him for having interfered only to make things worse. Don Quixote is ashamed when the boy turns on him, but "fué menester que los demás tuviesen mucha cuenta con no reirse, por no acaballe de correr del todo." The boy was angry, Don Quixote was ashamed, the bystanders found the situation funny. What are we to think about it?

Don Américo Castro, to whom every student of Cervantes owes a very great debt, considers these two incidents as an illustration of the principle of "moral error." Quixote thinks that his mere command will prevent Haldudo from carrying out his intention.

> Don Quijote no ha intentado reformar los motivos que determinaban a Haldudo a maltratar al nino Andrés, sino que suspende mecánicamente la acción de aquellos motivos con la amenaza de su lanza. Desaparecida la amenaza, la realidad moral de Haldudo vuelve a ser lo que naturalmente era: impulso cruel.
>
> Más adelante reaparece el muchacho para hacer bien patente el error del caballero . . . El esquema es sencillo: una realidad moral y un alucinado observador; como consecuencia, una trágica catástrofe para el mozo sin ventura que, maltrecho y pobre, marcha a Sevilla, dejando corrido a Don Quijote, y triste al lector. El generoso Hidalgo no ha soportado esta vez la consecuencia de su yerro; la

[10] Covarrubias denied that this proverb meant that boys were cruelly beaten. "El que pretende saber ha de trabajar y sudar, y esso significa allí sangre, y no açotar los muchachos con crueldad, como lo hazen algunos maestros de escuela tiranos." Did many other seventeenth-century voices protest?

víctima es un niño. El hecho es único en el *Quijote*, y deja en el ánimo infinita melancolía.[11]

Castro implies that the moral lesson of the Andrés incident lies in Don Quixote's mistake, but that Cervantes intended us to sympathize with the boy.

Gayton's *Notes* are only on Part I of *Don Quixote*. Both appearances of Andrés are included in his commentary. Among the comments are the following:

[a] *The other beholding such an antick to hover over him.*[12] Here is an Epitome in the *Don*, and the Master correcting his boy of *Bridewell* and *Bedlam*, only the *Don* hath grasse for Litter, and is allowed the use of a horse, which few *Furiosos* (except *Orlando*) though of the best quality, ever had before [p. 13].

[b] *The righter of Wrongs, and undoer of Injuries.*[13] Never did Knight take a title so inauspitiously both to himselfe and poore *Andrew*, for *Andrew* was forced to the Oake againe, though his Indentures were once cancelled. And the *Don* proved just contrary in the next exploit, being the abider of Wrongs, and undergoer, I cannot say, but underlayer of Injuries [p. 14].

[c] *Who glad above all measure for his successe.*[14] Had *Andrews* picture and the *Dons* been taken about the same businesse (for both were high exalted) they would have made exact pieces of *Heraclitus*, and *Democritus*, but *Dicitur infectâ re rediisse Domum.*[15] And the *Don* in this transportation was like the sleeper in the empty Theater; who comming before the Play, or Auditors, dream'd of the passages, and laugh'd, clapp'd, hiss'd, and stamp'd, as if the Players had been enter'd, *Vacuo sessor plausorque theatro.*[16] Even so, and so. To *Dulcinea*, the Empresse of his labours, all devoires are tendred for her inspirations of speech and valour, as a man should say, briefly thus:

> *Blest be* Dulcinea, *whose Favour I beseeching,*
> *Rescu'd poore* Andrew, *and his* Nock-Andro *from*
> *breeching* [p. 14].

[d] *O my Lord, doe you not know me? I am the youth* Andrew, *whom you unloosed from the Oak, whereunto I was tyed.*[17] *Don Quixot* (seeing his freed man *Andrew*) did arrogate unto himselfe the greatest piece of Chivalry that ever was performed by *Knight-Errant*, and is so transported with the confidence of *Andrew's* magnifying his redemption, and praising his most valorous and just encounter, that he cannot forebeare to make his mouth more unsavory by his owne vaine and foolish commendations, which he hop'd would have been seconded by *Andrew*. But such was the issue, as of his dialogue betwixt *Sancho* and himselfe, concerning *Dulcinea*, and tends as much to his honour, as that to hers [p. 194].

---

[11] *El pensamiento de Cervantes* (Madrid, 1925), p. 119.

[12] "El labrador que vió sobre sí aquella figura." I, 4.

[13] "El desfacedor de agravios y sinrazones." *Ibid.*

[14] "El cual, contenísimo de lo sucedido . . ." *Ibid.*

[15] I cannot find the source of this quotation.

[16] Horace, *Epist.*, 2, 2, 130.

[17] "¡Ay, señor mío! ¿No me conoce vuestra merced? Pues míreme bien; que yo soy aquel mozo Andrés que quitó vuestra merced de la encina donde estaba atado." I, xxxi.

[e] *Answer me, be not asham'd, nor stagger at all, but tell what poss'd to these Gentlemen.*[18]

Infandum (quoth Andrew) *jubes renovare dolorem.*[19]

Sir, pluck off my doublet, and there read the bloody History of my Mr. *Haldudo*, and poor *Andrew*; I am so scarified, that with a little salt, I should make an excellent Carbonado. Many a line there is in memory of your Honours intercession, (pox of your appearance) and the scoffs wherewith he e'r beate me, were as dolorous as the blows upon my back; in such and the like scurrilous words whispered, while he was lowder in his punishment.

> Andrew, *accept this wholesome Bastinado,*
> *'Tis sent you from your friend, great Don Bravado;*
> *Reliever of oppress'd servants from harsh Masters,*
> *And then he yerkt my back with his thong-wasters:*
> *And 'twixt his whips insults, and every stroke,*
> *O pray for your redeemer* Don *an Oake!*
> *And when soe'r the Knight shall passe this way,*
> *Tell him your Master gave you royall pay.*

Wherefore *Andrew* concludes all with a very plentifull curse upon *Don* to his Face, and all of his Tribe, though himselfe was newly entring into it, and wanted but a Master; *Gines Passamont* is about the wood (*Andrew*) and if you meet, you'l hardly part; you will live and dye together [p. 194].

Before Gayton could start to elaborate his conceits, he had to interpret the passages he commented upon. Among his farrago of conceits are ideas that may be relevant to the comprehension of this passage. They are:

(1) Gayton never considers the possibility that Haldudo was unjustly flogging Andrés. His references to "poor Andrew" in (b) and (e) are mocking; the phrase about "oppress'd servants" and "harsh masters" in (e) is supposed to be said by Haldudo. Gayton thinks of Bridewell Prison in which criminals were flogged (a), and he implies that Andrew and Ginés de Pasamonte will be fit companions for one another (e). This view of Andrés as a criminal seems as unwarranted as the passage previously quoted about the *licenciado* and Juana Gutiérrez; but is there not a certain similiarity between the first adventure of Andrés and that of the liberation of the galley slaves?

(2) If Andrés reminds Gayton of Bridewell, Quixote reminds him of Bedlam (that is, Bethlehem Hospital, the London "casa del Nuncio") (a). Perhaps Shelton (whose translation of *Don Quixote* Gayton used) is here responsible, for the Spanish "aquella figura" is farther from describing a lunatic than is the English "such an antick." Gayton's conceit is forced, but Cervantes has not yet revealed any subtleties at all in his descriptions of Don Quixote or in the words that have been put into

[18] "Responde; no te turbes ni dudes en nada; di lo que pasó a estos señores." *Ibid.*

[19] Virgil, *Aeneid*, II, 3.

his mouth. Up to the fourth chapter of Part I, Quixote never speaks naturally; he remains the poor hidalgo who "del poco dormir y del mucho leer se le secó el celebro de manera, que vino a perder el juicio." In this chapter we are given the first hints that he is less mad than he sometimes appears to be. The discussion of the equivalence of the shoes and bloodletting is perhaps lunatic, but the tone of the speech is normal, very different from the parodic address to the trollops at the inn (I, ii) or the challenges to Haldudo that he had just uttered. If Cervantes had stopped writing after the first sally of Don Quixote, no one could ever have suspected that the Knight might turn into a pattern of discretion, as he sometimes is in Part II. There is some excuse here for Gayton's crudity.

(3) In (c) Gayton has carelessly transposed Cervantes' contrast of Andrés and his master ("él se partió llorando y su amo se quedó riendo") to that of Andrés and Don Quixote. Nevertheless Cervantes had also described Quixote's happiness; he was "contentísimo de lo sucedido, pareciéndole que había dado felicísimo y alto principio a sus caballerías, con gran satisfación de sí mismo." The simile of the sleeper in the empty theater (c) well illustrates the emptiness of his triumph. Cervantes shows the reader the falsity of Quixote's self-satisfaction in I, iv, and in I, xxxi the fact is made apparent to Quixote himself and the bystanders. When in (d) Gayton says that Quixote made "his mouth more unsavoury by his owne vaine and foolish commendations," when in the wretched doggerel of (e) he is called "Don Bravado," the censures are not entirely pointless. Don Quixote calls himself "un tan valiente y tan nombrado caballero" in I, iv; in I, xxxi, he asks Andrés, "¿No notaste con cuánto imperio se lo mandé, y con cuánta humilidad prometió de hacer todo cuanto yo le impuse, y notifiqué, y quise?" Were not these remarks expressions of pride that called for punishment? Is not this punishment meted out by the muleteer of the Toledan merchants in the first instance (I, v) and by Andrés's exposure and insults in the second? The exposure and punishment of the boaster is commonplace enough in seventeenth-century literature (Clarín in *La vida es sueño*, Bobadill in Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour*, Parolles in Shakespeare's *All's Well that Ends Well*, etc.). Only our respect for the figure of Quixote as he appears in Part II can prevent us from finding a similar punishment here; but Part II was probably not even conceived when the fourth and thirty-first chapters of Part I were written. Gayton's remarks in (b) and (d) clearly show what he, a man of the seventeenth century, thought about this episode as an example of humbled pride; what he wrote in this connection cannot be dismissed as a mere irrelevancy. Perhaps there is no one single explanation of

what Cervantes intended to convey in any single incident in the *Quixote*; but, among the various notions that occur in these two chapters, the humiliation of a stupid pride certainly must find a place.

Besides Gayton's *Pleasant Notes*, there is another English Cervantine book that has some relevance. In 1711, Ned Ward published a coarse and inferior version of *Don Quixote* in Hudibrastic couplets.[20] This poem contains Ward's reflections on the various episodes he freely paraphrases. At the end of the adventure of the Merchants of Toledo (which Gayton, as we have seen, regarded as the punishment of Don Quixote's pride in the Andrés incident) Ward remarks:

> When Pride and Ign'rance jointly aim
> At Glory, they come off with Shame;
> And hair-brain'd Fools, that run at all,
> For want of Forecast, often fall [p. 152].

Ward agrees with Gayton. After Quixote rides away from Andrés and Haldudo, Ward introduces another consideration that should also be taken into account; he says:

> Thus he that does appear too fervent,
> 'Twixt a vex'd Master and his Servant,
> Like busy Fool 'twixt Man and Wife,
> Abates not, but foments the Strife [p. 134].

According to Ward, Don Quixote was a fool for interfering at all in this case. He was behaving imprudently and brought disaster after him. There is no reason why Cervantes should not have meant this episode to show lack of prudence in interfering at all, as well as "moral error" in the manner of this interference.

After looking at Gayton's comments on the two passages in which Andrés appears, the following conclusions may be drawn. In the first passage Don Quixote is shown as a burlesque figure of a lunatic; he interferes in a dispute between a master and a servant so imprudently that the lot of the servant is made worse by his interference. In both passages Quixote shows an unwarranted pride is his action, which is punished in the first case by the muleteer of the merchants of Toledo and in the second by the insults of Andrés. Cervantes, perhaps purposely, does not let us know whether Haldudo had any justification for punishing Andrés with such severity; but we are told that each had done less than his duty to the other. Gayton's jibe that Andrés will make a fit companion for Ginés de Pasamonte is typical of that writer's insensitivity; but there is a parallel between the behavior of Don Quixote

[20] *The Life and Notable Adventures of that Renown'd Knight, Don Quixote De la Mancha.* Merrily Translated into Hudibrastick Verse. By Edward Ward. London. 1711.

towards Andrés and his behavior towards the galley slaves; and there can be no doubt that the galley slaves were guilty criminals. I find it hard to believe that Cervantes meant to invoke in the reader feelings entirely favorable to Andrés; for, if he had so wished, he would have specified the loss sustained by Haldudo on account of Andrés' negligence. At most I feel that Cervantes was concerned to show a cruel master's excessive punishment of a lazy youth. Castro's judgment already quoted betrays a twentieth-century humanitarian attitude that Cervantes would not necessarily have felt. On the other hand, Castro's diagnosis of the "moral error" is acute, but it should be included among the other "moral errors"—lack of discretion and unjustified pride—that Don Quixote displayed in his unhappy intervention.[21]

University of London, King's College

[21] Ned Ward's "Epistle Dedicatory" contains a judgment on *Don Quixote* which is relevant to the conclusions given above. After referring to the fame that "the universally known Names of Don Quixote and Sancho Pancha [*sic*]" have brought to Cervantes, he continues: "Nor can the Mirth and Pleasantry of so renown'd a Comedy, be thought by any Prudent Person to trespass in the least upon the most reserv'd Gravity, since there are so many excellent Morals, thro' the whole Work, couch'd under every Adventure, shewing the ridiculous Vanity of such fantastical Bravadoes, who, for want of true Magnanimity, only mimick Greatness by a theatrical Deportment." This is of course an overstatement, but it indicates a view of the early part of *Don Quixote* that was, perhaps, part of Cervantes' intention.

DRYDEN AND THE RULES: THE PREFACE TO *TROILUS AND CRESSIDA*

JOHN C. SHERWOOD

THE Preface to Dryden's adaptation of Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* is one of the best, if not one of the liveliest, of Dryden's essays.[1] Although it contains one of his fine appreciations of Shakespeare, it lacks the pleasing self-revelation and the exciting personal controversy which distinguish the Preface to *All for Love* and the Preface to the *Fables*. On the other hand, it is somewhat more logical and systematic than many of the essays; it is the discussion of a single important problem and sticks close to the business at hand. The principles are expounded in a more complete and orderly fashion than in most of Dryden's essays, and the abstract exposition is constantly interspersed with applications to specific writers, especially Shakespeare. The principles are, as we shall see, French neoclassical principles of the most orthodox kind; and yet, when Dryden comes to apply them to Shakespeare, the judgment which he makes of the earlier poet is a very favorable one. It is all too easy for a reader of Dryden to imagine him as a man torn between a theoretical respect for the French "rules" and a natural love for such irregular writers as Chaucer and Shakespeare;[2] and this view certainly finds support in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, where Dryden, quite unable to reconcile Shakespeare and the rules, is forced to set up a double standard—regularity for the French and variety for the English. The *Essay*, however, is a relatively early work, and one should not assume that the critical dualism which it exhibits is characteristic of all Dryden's critical writing. Shakespeare and the rules were reconcilable; and the reconciliation is nowhere better illustrated than in the essay now before us.

The Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*, then, is of interest from two points of view. On the one hand, it demonstrates to a remarkable degree

[1] Most of the source parallels and many of the opinions advanced in this essay were originally set forth in my dissertation, *The Sources of John Dryden's Critical Essays*, presented in 1944 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Yale University. The references to Dryden's critical works are to *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. W. P. Ker (Oxford, 1900), here abbreviated as "Ker."

[2] Even Ker seems to incline to this view; see I, xiii-xiv.

Dryden's close dependence on the French critics, but, on the other, it also shows his ability to apply their rules sanely and sympathetically in situations where many would consider such application senseless or irreverent. It is with these two points that the present article is concerned.

Before these problems are dealt with, however, something needs to be said about the form and purpose of the Preface. Nothing could be more misleading than to regard the essay as a systematic critique or final evaluation of Shakespeare and Fletcher as poets and dramatists, or as an attempt to settle their place in literature. The main object of the essay is a much more limited and practical one; it is, as Dryden says, to inquire "how far we ought to imitate our own poets, Shakespeare and Fletcher, in their tragedies."[3] (The subject, one might add, is appropriate to the occasion, the *Troilus* being Dryden's revision or "correction" of Shakespeare's play of the same name.) To this central purpose the rest of the Preface (except for some preliminary remarks about the play itself) is subordinate; even the long discussion of "the grounds of criticism in tragedy" is simply intended to set up a standard by which the main question can be determined.

The Preface, then, is not an evaluation of Shakespeare's genius, but an estimate of his qualifications as a model for the dramatic poet. This approach demands a more critical attitude and a closer attention to faults than would otherwise be justified; defects which might be passed over in a merely appreciative essay cannot be ignored here, lest they seduce an unwary imitator; hence a moderate severity is appropriate. Perhaps a comparison will help to make Dryden's position clear. In the preface to the 1853 edition of his *Poems*, Matthew Arnold lays down as a law for the English writer "that his attention should be fixed on excellent models."[4] Such models he finds in the ancients, and he goes on to explain that he regards Shakespeare, who has less "purity of method" and whose merits are personal and "inseparable from his own rich nature," as "a less safe model." In a sense, Arnold is even more severe than Dryden, for he throws us wholly back upon the ancients, while Dryden strove to disentangle the classical parts in the English tragic writers, with the hope of retaining them as models. Nevertheless, the question is the same, the conclusions not unlike; and the comparison will serve to show that Dryden's problem is one of permanent literary interest, and not merely the unhappy outcome of an overrigorous neoclassicism.

What needs to be said about the form of the Preface is soon disposed of. There are two main parts: the "preface" proper,[5] discussing *Troilus*

[3] Ker, I, 207.

[4] *Poems of Matthew Arnold (1840-1867)*, ed. Sir A. T. Quiller-Couch (London, 1913), p. 9.

[5] Ker, I, 202-207.

and Cressida, and the essay on the "grounds of criticism in tragedy"—which is also an essay on Shakespeare and Fletcher as models for the dramatist.[6] According to Dryden's original plan, this section was to have consisted of an exposition of Aristotle's definition of tragedy, followed by a discussion of the four "parts" of a tragedy—plot, manners (including characters and passions), thoughts, and expressions. Actually Dryden breaks off in the middle of the discussion of the manners, and the last two "parts" receive only incidental treatment. There is a certain amount of rambling and digression; but on the whole the plan is respected.

That Dryden leaned heavily on the French critics in writing the Preface to *Troilus and Cressida* would probably be assumed by even a casual reader, for the neoclassical character of many of the statements is obvious and there are repeated references to Rapin and Le Bossu. That there is some borrowing Dryden himself admits; but it is only through painstaking investigation that we come to realize how extensive the borrowing is and how small a proportion of it is acknowledged. One should not be misled by Dryden's statement that "Aristotle with his interpreters, and Horace, and Longinus" are the authors to whom he owes his "lights."[7] These authors were evidently consulted and may be found quoted in the Preface; but Aristotle is almost invariably seen through the eyes of the French "interpreters," and Longinus was evidently known to Dryden chiefly through the translation of Boileau.[8] Even Horace does not come through quite pure; the passage on the manners[9] shows his influence, but with a heavy admixture of Le Bossu.[10]

The French influence shows itself at the very beginning of the discussion of the "grounds of criticism in tragedy." This section quite properly opens with Aristotle's definition of tragedy:

> It is an imitation of one entire, great, and probable action; not told, but represented; which, by moving in us fear and pity, is conducive to the purging of those two passions in our minds.[11]

This is a rather free rendering of Aristotle,[12] but there is nothing about

[6] Ker, I, 207-229.

[7] Ker, I, 207.

[8] This is proved by numerous verbal parallels; see Alfred Rosenberg, *Longinus in England bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1917), p. 20.

[9] Ker, I, 214-215.

[10] See below, pp. 78-79.

[11] Ker, I, 207. "Tragedy, then, is an imitation of an action that is serious, complete, and of a certain magnitude; in language embellished with each kind of artistic ornament, the several kinds being found in separate parts of the play; in the form of action, not of narrative; through pity and fear effecting the proper purgation of these emotions." *Poetics*, VI, 2, Butcher's translation.

[12] Note the introduction of the idea of probability (τὸ εἰκὸς), which plays an important part in the *Poetics* but does not actually form part of the definition; the

it that need detain us. Neither is it necessary to linger over Dryden's comments on the unity of action. His distinction between tragedy as consisting of the actions of "great persons" and comedy as consisting of the actions of those of inferior rank is interesting as being so thoroughly neoclassical;[13] but it is in the passages on probability and catharsis that the French influence really begins to be felt.

When, for instance, Dryden tells us that the action must be both "probable" and "admirable,"[14] since "that which is not wonderful is not great; and that which is not probable will not delight a reasonable audience,"[15] he is echoing Rapin:

> ... The Fable, besides the two parts already mention'd that compose it, must yet have two qualities to be perfect; it must be *admirable*, and it must be *probable*. By the first of these qualities it becomes worthy of admiration, and by the second it becomes worthy of belief. However admirable the Fable be, it can have no effect unless it be probable. The truth is, it strikes the Soul, because it is extraordinary, but it never enters, nor can it make any impression, by reason it appears incredible. Probability alone is too faint and *dull* for *Poetry*, and what is only admirable, is too *dazling*. 'Tis true, whatever appears incredible, is strongly relish'd by the curiosity of the people ... but the *Wise* cannot endure what is incredible ...[16]

The passage on catharsis is even more interesting. Dryden begins with a reference to the conventional doctrine (shared, of course, by Rapin) that the function of all poetry is "to instruct delightfully" and continues:

> To purge the passions by example, is therefore the particular instruction which belongs to Tragedy. Rapin, a judicious critic, has observed from Aristotle, that pride and want of commiseration are the most predominant vices in mankind; therefore, to cure us of these two, the inventors of Tragedy have chosen to work upon two other passions, which are fear and pity. We are wrought to fear by their setting before our eyes some terrible example of misfortune, which happened to persons of the highest quality; for such an action demonstrates to us that no condition is privileged from the turns of fortune; this must of necessity cause terror in us, and consequently abate our pride. But when we see that the most virtuous, as well as the greatest, are not exempt from such misfortunes, that consideration

---

omission of any reference to the "artistic ornaments," less important on the modern than on the Greek stage; and the rendering of τοιούτων as "those two"—a rendering not impossible in itself (compare Butcher's "these," W. H. Fyfe's "these and similar," Lane Cooper's "these two") but inconsistent with what Dryden says later about catharsis.

[13] Ker, I, 209. See René Bray, *La Formation de la doctrine classique en France* (Paris, 1927), pp. 307-308; and Hédelin d'Aubignac, *La Pratique du théâtre*, ed. Pierre Martino (Algiers, 1927), pp. 142-144.

[14] I.e., impressive, exciting, arousing wonder and surprise.

[15] Ker, I, 209.

[16] René Rapin, *Reflections on Aristotle's Treatise of Poesie* [translated by Thomas Rymer] (London, 1674), pp. 31-32. Numerous verbal resemblances point to Dryden's use of this translation; among them is his use of the word "probable" to translate the French "vraisemblable." In *An Essay of Dramatic Poesie* he speaks rather of "verisimility" (Ker, I, 59).

moves pity in us, and insensibly works us to be helpful to, and tender over, the distressed; which is the noblest and most godlike of moral virtues.[17]

Dryden is following Rapin closely enough, except in his statement that fear is caused by seeing the fall of the great and pity by the sufferings of the virtuous; Rapin does not so specialize the emotions.[18] Moreover,

Dryden passes over a whole section in which Rapin discusses the function of tragedy in moderating the passions:

But because man is naturally timorous, and compassionate, he may fall into another extreme, to be either too fearful, or too full of pity; the too much fear may shake the constancy of mind, and the too great compassion may enfeeble the equity... As the end of *Tragedy* is to teach men not to fear too weakly the common misfortunes, and manage their fear; it makes account also to teach them to spare their compassion, for objects that deserve it.[19]

It is just possible that this omission indicates that Dryden had a greater trust in the emotions than Rapin and others of his contemporaries;[20] but, regardless of the minor changes, the theory is still very much Rapin's. Dryden continues with some remarks about the tragic hero, who must, he says, be sufficiently virtuous to excite pity, but with certain "alloys of frailty" which will "leave room for punishment."[21] This is good enough Aristotle;[22] but the accompanying statement, that only the chief character need be virtuous and the others may be villains, recalls Corneille.[23] The section on catharsis concludes with two (acknowledged) quotations from Le Bossu and Rapin, the one in justification of the rules in general, the other on behalf of pity and terror as the proper emotions of tragedy.[24]

This analysis of Aristotle's definition of tragedy is followed in the Preface by a more general discussion of tragedy, which Dryden in-

[17] Ker, I, 209-210.

[18] At this point Dryden may be going back of Rapin to the original text of Aristotle, who says that pity is caused by the misfortunes of the innocent (*τὸν ἀνάξιον δυστυχοῦντα*) and fear by the misfortunes of one like ourselves (*τὸν ὅμοιον*); see *Poetics*, XIII, 2. Dryden follows him on the first point; on the second he deviates in line with the later conception of tragedy as the "fall of princes." On this latter, see Corneille, "Discours de la Tragédie," *Œuvres*, ed. C. Marty-Laveaux (Paris, 1862), I, 54.

[19] Rapin, *op. cit.*, pp. 103-104.

[20] Baxter Hathaway, "John Dryden and the Function of Tragedy," *PMLA*, LVIII (1943), 665.

[21] Ker, I, 210-211.

[22] *Poetics*, XIII. But Dryden seems to demand a higher degree of virtue than Aristotle.

[23] The French critic, trying to decide what Aristotle meant by saying that the manners should be "good" (see below, p. 79), mentions the interpretation of Castelvetro, "que cette bonté de mœurs ne regarde que le premier personnage, qui doit toujours se faire aimer, et par conséquent être vertueux, et non pas ceux qui le persécutent." Corneille, *op. cit.*, I, 35.

[24] Ker, I, 211; René Le Bossu, *Traité du poëme epique*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1677), I, 1-3; Rapin, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-106.

tended, as we have seen, to divide into four parts—plot, manners (including characters and passions), thoughts, and expressions—the last two being, in the end, omitted. The plan is in itself an indication of classical and neoclassical influence. Aristotle lists the parts of tragedy as plot, character (Dryden's "manners"), diction (Dryden's "expressions"), thought, spectacle, and song;[25] Le Bossu uses a similar scheme in discussing the epic, and so does Rapin.[26] Dryden has little to say on the subject of plot, leaving that point to Rymer, who had already discussed it in his *Tragedies of the Last Age Considered* (1678); and, after a short digression in which he applies to tragedy Le Bossu's rule that an epic poem must be founded on and centered around some precept of morality,[27] he proceeds to a lengthy consideration of the manners.[28] Following Le Bossu, Dryden defines the manners as "those inclinations, whether natural or acquired, which move and carry us to actions, good, bad, or indifferent, in a play; or which incline the persons to such or such actions."[29] Dryden notes that they should not be gratuitously villainous.[30] They are distinguished "by complexion, as choleric and phlegmatic, or by the differences of age or sex, of climates, or quality of the persons, or their present condition"; and they must be learned from "natural Philosophy, Ethics, and History; all of which, whosoever is ignorant, does not deserve the name of poet."[31] These distinctions owe something to the fourth book of Le Bossu:

> Les Causes des Mœurs sont ou entierement hors de nous, ou toutes en nous; ou elles peuvent être considérées comme étant en partie extérieures, & en partie intérieures. Les causes extérieures sont Dieu, les Astres, & le Païs où l'on est né. Les causes mélées sont les Parens & l'Education. Les intérieures sont la complexion, le sexe, les passions, & les actions par le moïen des-quelles on contracte des habitudes . . .
>
> La Poësie n'est pas la seule discipline où l'on voïe les Mœurs. Les Philosophes,

[25] *Poetics*, VI, 7. Spectacle is perhaps omitted as not strictly a matter of literary criticism, and song as unimportant on the modern stage.

[26] Le Bossu, *op. cit.*; René Rapin, *La Comparaison d'Homère et de Virgile*, in *Œuvres diverses* (Amsterdam, 1686), I.

[27] Le Bossu, *op. cit.*, I, 37.

[28] The ἤθη of Aristotle, the "mœurs" of the French critics. The word does not refer to the usages of polite society, but to the characteristic traits and habits of men either as individuals or as members of social groups; hence the "manners of Achilles" or the "manners of a king." The distinction is made clear by Hobbes: "By Manners, I mean not here, Decency of behaviour; as how one man should salute another, or how a man should wash his mouth, or pick his teeth before company . . . But those qualities of man-kind, that concern their living together in Peace, and Unity." *Leviathan*, ed. A. D. Lindsay (Everyman ed., London, 1940), p. 49.

[29] Ker, I, 213; Le Bossu, *op. cit.*, Book IV, chap. i.

[30] Aristotle, *Poetics*, XV, 5; Le Bossu, *op. cit.*, II, 50-51; Ker, I, 210.

[31] Ker, I, 214.

les Historiens, les Géographes, & les Rhéteurs, en traitent aussi bien que les Poëtes. Chacun d'eux a sa maniere; mais le Poëte a besoin des autres.[32]

The resemblance is not complete; but it would be easy for Dryden to draw up his own list, using what he remembered from the Frenchman.

Following these general recommendations, Dryden lays down the four rules for the poetic treatment of the manners. These rules also are based on Aristotle,[33] as interpreted by Le Bossu. Aristotle had said that the ἤθη (manners) must be χρηστά (good). But to say that the manners must be good in a moral sense is to exclude all but virtuous characters from the stage. Therefore Dryden, following Le Bossu, interprets χρηστά as "apparent":

But as the manners are useful in this art, they may be all comprised under these general heads: first, they must be apparent; that is, in every character of the play, some inclinations of the person must appear; and these are shown in the actions and discourse.[34]

There is no difficulty about the second rule:

Secondly, the manners must be suitable, or agreeing to the persons; that is, to the age, sex, dignity, and the other general heads of manners: thus, when a poet has given the dignity of a king to one of his persons, in all his actions and speeches, that person must discover majesty, magnanimity, and jealousy of power, because these are suitable to the general manners of a king.[35]

In the third rule again there is some interpretation; Aristotle had spoken of τὸ ὅμοιον, which Butcher translates "true to life"; but Le Bossu makes it refer to the resemblance of a historical character to his original. So Dryden translates "resemblance" and tells us that "when a poet has the known character of this or that man before him, he is bound to represent him as such."[36] The fourth rule is plain enough:

[32] *Op cit.*, II, 4. This material is expanded by Le Bossu in the chapters which follow (pp. 5 ff.).

[33] *Poetics*, XV, 1-5.

[34] Ker, I, 214. This interpretation is noted and rejected by Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, 4th ed. (London, 1932), p. 327; he refers to both Dryden and Le Bossu. "J'ai donc interprété cet endroit selon la Morale, & j'ay crû qu'Aristote avoit voulu nous enseigner que les Mœurs Poëtiques étoient également Bonnes, soit qu'elles fussent Bonnes, soit qu'elles fussent mauvaises moralement; pourvu que le Poete les fit prévoir telles que des personnes bonnes ou mauvaises les doivent prendre." Le Bossu, *op. cit.*, II, 49. Le Bossu's influence on Dryden's discussion of the manners has also been noticed by Franz Weselmann, *Dryden als Kritiker* (Mulheim a.d. Ruhr, 1893), pp. 38-40.

[35] Ker, I, 214. The example is from Le Bossu: "Aussi-tôt que le Poëte a donné la dignité de Roi à un de ses Personnages; sans qu'on l'entende parler ou qu'on le voïe agir, on sait qu'il doit être grave, magnifique, jaloux de son autorité, &c." *Op. cit.*, II, 32-33. Cf. Horace, *Ars Poetica*, lines 153-178, and Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, II, 12-17.

[36] Ker, I, 214; Le Bossu, *op. cit.*, II, 55. Both Le Bossu and Dryden were probably thinking of a passage in Horace's *Ars Poetica* (lines 119-127) to which Dryden refers (Ker, I, 215).

The last property of manners is, that they be constant and equal, that is, maintained the same through the whole design: thus, when Virgil had once given the name of *pious* to Aeneas, he was bound to show him such, in all his words and actions, through the whole poem.[37]

Dryden ends his account of the manners with a reference to Horace's lines on the subject.[38]

After the manners come the characters, which are derived from them; "for, indeed, the characters are no other than the inclinations, as they appear in the several persons of the poem; a character being thus defined,—that which distinguishes one man from another."[39] The definition is from Le Bossu: "Le Caractère d'une Personne est ce qu'elle a de propre & de singulier, & qui la distingue d'avec les autres."[40] The rest of the paragraph comes from the same source. We are told that a character cannot consist of one vice or virtue alone, but must embrace several mutually compatible qualities (Dryden instances Falstaff), with one predominating, "as covetousness in Crassus, love of his country in Brutus."[41] Dryden again remarks that the hero must have more of virtue than of vice in order to arouse pity, and he puts forward as his own the recommendation that the pity and terror be concentrated (as in his own *Oedipus*) on the chief character, since "terror and compassion work but weakly when they are divided into many persons."[42]

After the discussion of the characters comes the discussion of the passions—not, in this case, the pity and fear to be aroused in the audience, but the "anger, hatred, love, ambition, jealousy, revenge, etc., as they are shown in this or that person of the play."[43] Dryden, referring to Longinus, speaks of the necessity the poet is under to study moral philosophy in order to understand them, and of the errors which may occur in their treatment.[44] He continues:

Longinus, whom I have hitherto followed, continues thus: *If the passions be artfully employed, the discourse becomes vehement and lofty: if otherwise, there is nothing more ridiculous than a great passion out of season:* and to this purpose he animadverts severely upon Aeschylus, who writ nothing in cold blood, but was always in a rapture, and in fury with his audience: the inspiration was still upon

[37] Ker, I, 215.
[38] *Ars Poetica*, lines 156, 119, 126-127.
[39] Ker, I, 215.
[40] *Op. cit.*, II, 67.
[41] Ker, I, 215-216; Le Bossu, *op. cit.*, II, 95 ff.
[42] Ker, I, 216. Although Dryden seems to have forgotten it, Corneille had laid down a similar law: "... Établissons pour maxime que la perfection de la tragédie consiste bien à exciter de la pitié et de la crainte, par le moyen d'un premier acteur . . . mais que cela n'est pas d'une necessité . . . absolue . . ." Corneille, *op. cit.*, I, 62.
[43] Ker, I, 220.
[44] Ker, I, 220. Dryden gives a rather inaccurate account of Longinus here; see Ker's note (I, 318) and Rosenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

him, he was ever tearing it upon the tripos; or (to run off as madly as he does, from one similitude to another) he was always at high-flood of passion, even in the dead ebb and lowest water-mark of the scene.[45]

Here there are references to several passages in Longinus:

. . . J'ose dire qu'il n'y a peut-être rien qui relève davantage un discours qu'un beau mouvement et une passion poussée à propos . . .

Il y a encore un troisième défaut opposé au grand, qui regarde le pathétique. Théodore l'appelle une fureur hors de saison, lorsqu'on s'échauffe mal à propos, ou qu'on s'emporte avec excès quand le sujet ne permet que de s'échauffer médiocrement.

Au reste, bien que ce poète [Eschyle], pour vouloir trop s'élever, tombe assez souvent dans des pensées rudes, grossières et mal polies, Euripide . . . s'expose quelquefois aux mêmes périls.[46]

Poetry is not madness, Dryden says, and, if the play is not to become a mere chaos of passion, certain rules must be observed. One rule is to prepare the audience for the passion—to begin calmly and work up by degrees, as Ulysses did in his debate with Ajax. The other is "to put nothing into the discourse which may hinder your moving of the passions"—in other words, to avoid mixing contradictory passions and not to allow pointed wit to mingle with solemn emotions.[47] The two rules and the example of Ulysses and Ajax come from Le Bossu.[48]

This brings us virtually to the end of the list of Dryden's borrowings from the French critics in the Preface to *Troilus and Cressida*. A few additional parallels might be cited,[49] but enough material has already been collected to show that, although Dryden does sometimes go back directly to the "classical" critics, Aristotle, Longinus, and Horace, yet for the most part he is content with their interpreters, and the greater

[45] Ker, I, 221.

[46] *Traité du Sublime*, VI, II, XIII, Boileau's trans., *Œuvres de Boileau* (Paris, 1929), III, 154, 143, 180. For the criticism of Aeschylus, Rosenberg (*op. cit.*, p. 24) and Ker refer to Longinus, III, 1, where a fragment from a lost tragedy of Aeschylus is criticized for its bombast. Boileau, however, does not give the author of the fragment, and Dryden probably did not know that it belonged to Aeschylus. Dryden's real source is Rapin: ". . . Aeschylus never speaks in *cold blood*, and sayes the most indifferent things in a *tragick huff* . . . . Finally, his *Enthusiasm*, it seems, never left him, he is so exalted, and so little natural." Rapin, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-118.

[47] Ker, I, 222-223.

[48] "Nous avons encore deux choses à dire ici des Passions. L'une est le moïen de les faire recevoir aux Auditeurs; l'autre est le moïen de les leur faire sentir. Le premier est de les y disposer: & le second est de ne point mêler ensemble plusieurs passions incompatibles." Le Bossu, *op. cit.*, I, 348; see also I, 349, 353-354.

[49] Note the quotation from Rapin that concludes the Preface (Ker I, 228-229, Rapin, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17); the quotation from Le Bossu on pp. 218-219; the reference to the *liaison des scènes*, an echo of Corneille (Ker, I, 204); and the criticism of Aeschylus, which is based on Rapin (Ker, I, 202, Rapin, *op. cit.*, p. 117—the reference to Quintilian is in Rapin).

part of the theory set down in the Preface is French neoclassical doctrine of the most orthodox kind.

The theories set forth in the Preface are, then, unmistakably French; and, if we accept the common view that Dryden's love for Shakespeare and his respect for the rules were somehow at odds, then we should expect that Shakespeare would be shabbily treated in the Preface or that there would be some sort of evasion or escape into critical dualism, such as we have in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. Nevertheless, when we examine the passages in which Shakespeare and Fletcher are evaluated as dramatic models, we find that Shakespeare, at least, comes off rather well, and that the rules of Rapin and Le Bossu serve not only to expose his faults but to emphasize his virtues. He emerges as a poet endowed with a multitude of neoclassical virtues; his manners are "apparent" and appropriate, his thoughts are natural, his characters distinguished, he can move terror, and he can "prepare" a passion. To be sure, his plots are condemned as defective and his style as obsolete and too full of figures; but these criticisms are much outweighed by the enthusiastic praise, praise which is expressed, one should add, in terms of the rules.

In the Preface to *Troilus and Cressida* we see nothing of that peculiar conflict between the rules of art and the works of art which appears in the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*. When he wrote the *Essay*, Dryden was beginning to accept the French rules, yet he still respected the plays of the earlier English writers. Moreover, he seemed to see no hope of reconciling the plays of Shakespeare with the rules of Corneille, and as a result he practically set up two standards of criticism. If a play could be proved regular, it was set down as excellent; if it fell outside the rules, then it was praised for its "liveliness." There is no such difficulty in the Preface. Here the rules serve as convenient categories for analyzing the excellence of Shakespeare's art. There are some traces of dogmatism and artificiality; the royalist in Dryden will not permit a "lawful prince" to have a vicious character, and the gentleman in him will not allow a man to wound a woman.[50] Even in such matters he is usually sensible, especially in comparison with Rymer. It must have been a considerable satisfaction to Dryden to be able to evolve rules of dramatic art which no longer conflicted with what he himself thought was excellent in the drama which he knew.

To conclude: In the Preface to *Troilus and Cressida* the rules serve two definite purposes. Dryden was trying to use them as a means for reducing Shakespeare's dramatic art into a method, so that he might codify it and convey some of the older dramatist's excellence into his own works. He also wished to know wherein Shakespeare had erred, so that he might avoid copying him in these points. At the same time, the

[50] Ker, I, 218.

rules served as a kind of vocabulary through which he could communicate his own feeling and enthusiasm for the works of the older drama. At times the vocabulary is imperfect; Dryden seems puzzled to explain how *A King and No King* pleases him, and he can only offer two tentative explanations, both based on the rules.[51] For all this, there is, in comparison with the *Essay*, far less of a gap between what Dryden felt and what he thought he ought to feel. Thus, although the *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* is a far more lively piece of literature, the Preface to *Troilus and Cressida* is sounder in its doctrine and more satisfying as a work of criticism.

University of Oregon

---

[51] Ker, I, 212.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE MYTH OF FELT. By Leonardo Olschki. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949. vii, 76 p.

This handsome little book by Professor Olschki contains an historical account of the symbolic significance of felt cloth in Asia and Europe, and presents a new interpretation of Dante's line, "E sua nazion sarà tra feltro e feltro," in *Inferno* I, 105.

The author does not undertake to interpret the whole prophecy about the *Veltro* which is to destroy the *lupa* (the wolf that defeats Dante's attempt to climb the hill), but he is of the opinion that the *Veltro* is "not . . . precisely a Great Khan of Tartary, nor necessarily a Can Grande of Verona,[1] but just a wise, human and powerful leader born under the most favorable constellation" (p. 43). This opinion is in general agreement with that of Vittorio Cian in his *Oltre l'enigma dantesca del Veltro*.[2] Cian says: "un principe laico ben 'complessionato' dal cielo" (p. 26), and, although he does not discuss the significance of *feltro*, he would, like Olschki, disapprove the use of capital "F" ("tra Feltro e Feltro") by the *Testo Critico* of 1921, which favors the identification of the *Veltro* with Can Grande, born between Feltre and Montefeltro.

In his commentary on the *Inferno*, Boccaccio mentions without much sympathy an explanation of *feltro* based on the use of felt at the funerals of Tartar emperors; in Asia this material had symbolic meanings that were strange to Europe. Olschki gives us the relevant facts and sources of information with that particular competency which has informed his previous writings.[3] "Felt is the universally employed material of all nomadic tribes in Asia and above all else the characteristic mark of their rudimentary pastoral civilization. It was used . . . for the making of tents and weapons, of clothes and rugs . . . Its use in religious ceremonial is attested by felt idols preserved in every dwelling and mentioned by all mediaeval travellers . . . . When Ghengis Khan adopted a comprehensive designation for the unified Turko-Mongolian tribes of Asia, he called them . . . 'the generations that live in felt tents' . . ." (pp. 13-14).

It was a poor, common cloth, but after the Tartar conquests, when it had vanished from the imperial court and from rich dwellings, it continued to be used with increased importance in funeral ceremonies. ". . . In Dante's and Boccaccio's time a Ghengiside sovereign was buried *'tra feltro e feltro'* in accordance with a very old Oriental ceremonial and symbolism . . . ," which may possibly, as Boccaccio thought, have signified "humility in the face of death" and "the transitoriness of human power and glory" (p. 18).

---

[1] Not that he overlooks the possible mental association of *cane* with *Can Grande* and *Khan*; on the contrary he reminds us of Dante's "nomina sunt consequentia rerum" (*Vita Nuova*, XIII, 5) a quotation from the glosses in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, familiar to lawyers. See Bruno Nardi in *GSLIt*, XCIII, 101-105.

[2] Torino, 1945. This is a revision of the whole question, bringing up to date his well-known work, *Sulle orme del Veltro* (1897).

[3] "Der Presbyter Johannes," *Historische Zeitschrift* (1931); *Storia letteraria delle scoperte geografiche* (Firenze, 1937); "Dante e l'Oriente," *Giornale Dantesco*, XXXIX (1938); *Guillaume Boucher* (Baltimore, 1946).

It was also used at the election of emperors. Giovanni Villani describes the elevation of Ghengis Khan "sopra un povero feltro," after which he was called "Cane," that is, emperor.[4] This custom was as old as the sixth century, when an emperor of North China was raised on a black felt by seven of the highest dignitaries of the state, and thus "made obeisance to heaven" (p. 28). The symbolic significance was not in the raising of the emperor but in the covering of the feudal lords with the felt. The emperor was covered, that is protected, by heaven; they were covered, protected, by him; he made obeisance to heaven, they to him; he was between the two coverings, and the rug of felt was "intended as a symbol of heaven or a duplicate of it" (p. 30).

Jacopo and Pietro Alighieri, in their commentaries, say that "tra feltro e feltro" means "between heaven and heaven" as do Da Buti and Landino, and Benvenuto da Imola says "between heaven and earth," but our author does not see in these comments any reference to an Asiatic custom. He is no doubt right, for none of these commentators mention an Eastern emperor; they explain the *Veltro* in other ways. He thinks the comment of the sons of Dante "in all probability reflects some vague adumbration expressed by the poet himself." They "would not have thought of explaining 'tra feltro e feltro' as an allusion to heaven without a suggestion from the poet himself. But he was not explicit enough to satisfy the curiosity of his relatives, friends and commentators" (p. 35). Some readers may think that, if Dante had given any explanation to his sons, he would have been more explicit; and, since, as far as I remember, they nowhere say anything about information received from their father, it seems more likely to me that, impressed by the fact that this prophecy is being uttered by Virgil, the author of the fourth eclogue, they decided that the puzzling word *feltro* corresponded to the *caelo* in "Jam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto."[5]

How could Dante have known about the symbolic felt of the Far East? Not from Villani but perhaps from Villani's source, the *Oriental History* of the Armenian Prince Hayton, written in French and translated into Latin by Nicholas Fauton in 1307 or soon after (p. 22). From Marco Polo's book and from the account of the election of a Khan in Vincent de Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale* he would have gathered nothing about felt. "Dante," says Olschki, "had a vision very personal to himself of exotic things and little interest in the Asiatic world. There is no way of understanding how he could have transferred to a Christian redeemer a barbarous ritual of the nomadic tribes of the steppes, and have developed its celestial implications as connected with their pagan myths and customs" (p. 36).

Nevertheless, our author himself has shown us how knowledge of the Far East flowed into Italy by means of traders and missionaries, and how the legend of Prester John, fused with that of the Khans of Tartary, has features that remind one of the *Monarchia* as well as the *Commedia* (pp. 4, 9). Giovanni Villani devotes ten chapters of his *Istorie Fiorentine* to the doings of the Tartars. Whence did Boccaccio derive his information? It is hardly to be assumed that Dante knew nothing about the use of felt in Asiatic ceremonies; and the possibility cannot be excluded that, in framing a prophecy which was meant to be obscure, the Tartar felt may have occurred to him as a symbol of immense wealth and power accompanied by great simplicity.

Olschki points out that *nazione* means *birth*, not *election*, and it certainly means

[4] I think A. Bassermann was the first to connect this passage of Villani with the prophecy of Dante, in "Veltro, Gross-Khan und Kaisersage," *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, X (1900).

[5] Pietro says: "Tu dic inter feltrum et feltrum, idest *inter coelum et coelum*, talis temporalis virtuosus *inferius infundetur*."

neither *death* nor *funeral*. He is probably right, although metaphorically the word might mean *rise* or *apparition*, "apparire," as the Anonimo Selmi says, for whom the *Veltro* is Christ. "Birth" suggests a horoscope in times when astrological influences were believed in universally. Nearly all the early commentators mention the influence of stars somewhere in their explanations of the whole prophecy; our author cites Pietro Alighieri, Boccaccio, Da Buti, and Landino; he might have added Bambaglioli, Jacopo Alighieri, Della Lana, and the Anonimo Fiorentino. Pietro says that his father is bent on showing his knowledge of astrology, and Dante himself, in a companion prophecy to this one (*Purg.*, XXXIII, 37-51), attributes the event prophesied to "stelle propinque."[6]

The only constellation that has to do with felt is that of Gemini, the Twins, in which the felt caps of the Dioscuri are conspicuous. They are "the *pilleati fratres* or felt-capped brothers Castor and Pollux, traditionally depicted with their felt caps in the miniatures of mediaeval astrological treatises. In Dante's day the many statues of these most popular pagan divinities of Italy had, of course, vanished,[7] just as the innumerable Roman coins with the features and symbols of the Dioscuri had long since disappeared; but Hyginus, the mythographer read by mediaeval scholars, had preserved the memory of the characteristic attribute handed down in the traditional iconography of the Twins. The association of a felt cap with those *lucida sidera* was so familiar in antiquity that two of these felt caps surmounted by a star were sufficient for the evocation of the third constellation of the zodiac and of its embodiment in the two mythical brothers.[8] In the Carolingian epoch, when miniatures of old pagan divinities were painted after the remnants of antique images, Paul the Deacon, epitomizing Festus' Latin vocabulary, explained the *pillea Castoris et Pollucis* as a Spartan mark of the two sons of Leda" (pp. 39-40).

Dante's own constellation was Gemini; he was born when the sun was rising and setting with the Twins, as he says in *Par.*, XXII, where he also proudly and gratefully attributes all his genius to them. This is the fact that makes the new interpretation important. Another poet might not have remembered or known that the Dioscuri always wore felt caps; Dante almost certainly did. He would see illustrations in astronomical manuscripts, he would find out all that was to be known about his own sign of the zodiac. Virgil, the speaker of these lines, was aware of the significance of the Roman *pilleum* as a popular symbol of liberty; "the Dioscuri were always worshipped as *soteres*, 'saviors,' and as protectors of mankind" (p. 65, n. 122). "Mediaeval astrologers and the early interpreters of the *Commedia* agree in attributing to the influence of the Twins the wisdom acquired through poetry and science. Poets and mythographers found in the inseparable heavenly brothers a symbol of fraternal love" (pp. 42-43). Born between the middle of May and the middle of June, "the world's new redeemer, whoever he might be, would be impressed so strongly by the constellation that he would secure to mankind the triumph of love and virtue embodied in the two felt-capped mythological brothers" (p. 42). They were hunters besides; the *lupa* would have no chance. The preposition *tra* in "tra feltro e feltro" is understood to be an allusion to the fact that Castor and Pollux "never appear together, but rather in alternating phases" (p. 64, n. 115), a fact made much use of by the mythologists.

---

[6] One might add that, before Dante, prophecies of a coming Ghibelline deliverer were accompanied by astrological references. See Cian, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[7] The colossal statues of Castor and Pollux at the head of the ramp leading up to the Piazza del Campidoglio at Rome were not there in Dante's time, but they are ancient statues and they have their caps.

[8] One of the four interesting plates which adorn this book reproduces one side of a Spartan coin with nothing but the word *Lakedaimonion* in Greek letters and two caps surmounted by stars.

The new interpretation is consistent and well supported. The only apparent objection to it is that it *is* new; and that is not a strong objection, since the early commentators of the *Inferno* show that they have no confidence in their own guesses. Boccaccio, the one who has most to say about the riddle, gives it up completely; Pietro Alighieri mentions the Feltre and Montefeltro hypothesis[9] but does not accept it; instead he recommends *tra cielo e cielo* without saying why. Nearly all of them, however, lend indirect support to Olschki's interpretation in that, remembering Virgil's fourth eclogue, they feel that this prophecy too must be in some way astrological. If Dante is here designating a group of stars to preside over the birth of the *Veltro*, that group is probably the Twins, and "feltro e feltro" refers to their felt caps. The poet himself, however, has made it impossible for us to be sure, by so choosing the words of his prophecy that only the *fatti* (*Purg.*, XXXIII, 49) could make it clear to his readers—and to himself. Those *fatti* have never occurred; the *Veltro* has never come, and the *lupa* is still patrolling the mountain side.[10]

J. E. Shaw

Toronto

André Gide et la pensée allemande. By Renée Lang. Paris: Egloff, 1949. 218 p.

L' *André Gide* de Mme Lang mérite de retenir l'attention des lecteurs. Modeste d'apparence, ce petit livre recèle une matière abondante qui le place de pair avec ce que la critique a produit de meilleur jusqu'à ce jour sur André Gide. Sans s'écarter de son propos, à savoir, l'influence exercée sur Gide par la pensée d'outre-Rhin, ni déplacer, pourrait-on dire, son objectif, l'auteur nous donne des aperçus originaux et ouvre des jours nombreux et neufs tant sur la personnalité d'André Gide que sur son œuvre.

Que Gide ait été—et cela par principe—*influencé* aussi bien qu'*influenceur*, c'est ce que chacun savait. Qu'il ait subi l'ascendant de certains penseurs allemands, en particulier de Nietzsche et de Goethe, cela encore on ne l'ignorait pas. Sur ce point, comme sur tant d'autres, le *Journal* renseigne amplement les curieux. Restait à montrer la mesure dans laquelle ces influences s'étaient fait sentir et les métamorphoses qu'elles avaient subies. Entreprise n'allant pas sans difficultés, et qui comportait des dosages délicats exigeant autant de tact que de perspicacité, voire de subtilité. En un mot: comme dans tout problème littéraire où il s'agit d'influences, il fallait qu'à l'esprit de géométrie l'auteur allie l'esprit de finesse et que son érudition se double de flair. Des difficultés inhérentes à la tentative, Mme Lang s'est tirée tout à son honneur. Disons tout de suite que la méthode par elle adoptée n'a pas peu contribué au bon succès de l'entreprise.

Quels ont été les contacts de Gide avec la pensée allemande? Où, quand, comment et pourquoi ces contacts se sont-ils établis? Enfin, quel en a été le résultat? Telles sont en gros les questions auxquelles l'auteur s'est efforcée de répondre. Elle a consacré le premier tiers de son livre (chaps. I-III) à situer son problème. Historiquement d'abord, en faisant un examen rapide des réactions de la France au rayonnement de la pensée allemande au XIXème siècle, plus particulièrement à l'époque du symbolisme qui correspond à la jeunesse de Gide. Psychologiquement

[9] He probably got it from the *Fiorita* of Armannino, completed in 1325. (See Cian, *op. cit.*, p. 65) Armannino says nothing about Can Grande and neither does Pietro; it was Vellutello in the sixteenth century who proposed Can Grande for the *Veltro*.

[10] Long ago Parodi (in *BSDIt*, XVIII, 274) recalled an obscure serventese, written before 1279 and discovered by Casini, in which *peltro* and *feltro* rhyme with *veltro*. He says these are the only possible rhymes.

ensuite. Ici, il s'agissait de mettre en évidence celles des qualités de Gide qui l'ont rendu particulièrement perméable: curiosité d'esprit inlassable, disponibilité passionnée, don marqué de réceptivité, "merveilleuse faculté de sympathie." Pour cet esprit ouvert, tout auteur étranger joue le triple rôle de "révélateur, approbateur, provocateur." Biographiquement enfin, en nous renseignant sur Gide et ses études de l'allemand, ses voyages outre-Rhin, ses contacts avec des contemporains (Hoffmannsthal, George, Rilke, E. R. Curtius, Thomas Mann) qui firent office d'intermédiaires. Les trois chapitres faisant suite à cette mise au point préalable constituent le corps même de l'ouvrage. On y trouve retracée l'influence qu'exercèrent tour à tour sur Gide les auteurs romantiques et philosophes allemands (Heine, Novalis, Schopenhauer, etc.; chap. IV), puis Nietzsche (chap. V) et enfin Goethe (chap. VI) sur lequel Mme Lang s'attarde, comme de juste, le plus longuement. Une courte conclusion termine l'exposé en en résumant les points principaux.

Si la pensée des auteurs romantiques et des métaphysiciens d'outre-Rhin devait surtout attirer le Gide de l'époque mystique et symboliste—au point de lui faire entreprendre des traductions de Novalis, Chamisso, Hebbel, d'autres encore, qui restèrent, d'ailleurs, inachevées—si l'influence de Nietzsche s'est fait avant tout sentir dans la vie de Gide à l'époque correspondant à l'étape de la libération; enfin, si l'ascendant de Goethe, tout en s'affirmant tout du long, semble avoir surtout marqué au cours des dernières années; il n'en reste pas moins qu'essentiellement parlant, il ne s'agit pas là d'une série d'influences ou d'étapes se succédant dans un ordre chronologique, mais bien plutôt, ainsi que Mme Lang l'a très bien compris et fait voir, de divers centres d'influences. Le chevauchement de ces différents centres et leurs recoupements devaient nécessairement entrainer, dans l'exposé, certaines répétitions et quelques redites. L'auteur a eu le courage d'en prendre allégrement son parti. Le plan qu'elle a suivi était la meilleure manière d'amener le lecteur à toucher en quelque sorte du doigt la complexité de Gide, son balancement constant entre des pôles opposés, et cette neutralisation des contradictions où il semble trouver son équilibre. Il suffit d'avoir tant soit peu fréquenté Gide pour se rendre compte qu'à parler de lui, il est impossible de ne pas revenir sans cesse sur ses pas: l'analyse de l'"état de dialogue"—si cher à Gide—entraine forcément la reprise des mêmes thèmes selon des perspectives différentes.

Des nombreux points que met en relief l'étude de Mme Lang, signalons en passant quelques-uns: l'affinité de l'ironie gidienne avec l'ironie romantique allemande; l'incompatibilité foncière—"de tempérament, de sensibilité et d'expression"—à laquelle il faut attribuer l'avortement des traductions de l'allemand entreprises par Gide; l'explication de la glorification du bâtard qui figure dans plusieurs de ses œuvres, explication à chercher dans le tempérament de l'auteur; enfin et surtout, le mélange, chez Gide, de l'idéal dionysien, représenté par Nietzsche, et de l'idéal apollonien, incarné en Goethe.[1] Mais si Nietzsche a été repoussé, en définitive, au profit de Goethe, et si c'est à l'idéal apollonien que, dans sa recherche de la sérénité, Gide a donné, pour finir, la préférence, l'explication s'en trouve autant dans les racines profondes de son tempérament que sur le plan de son esthétique. C'est au nom de son art que Gide a repoussé le Surhomme nietzschéen-dionysien, mais c'est aussi par obéissance à une peur salutaire de l'abime dont la fin tragique de l'écrivain allemand avait révélé l'existence. De même, la vénération de Gide pour Goethe, en qui le classique l'attirait tout particulièrement, s'est visiblement accompagnée, sur le plan personnel, d'un désir d'identification.

[1] Que Goethe ait pu servir à Gide de contre-poids à la fois à Nietzsche et au Christ, voilà qui ne nous paraît pas manquer de piquant.

D'un bilan de l'étude, il se dégage deux constatations essentielles. C'est d'abord qu'en toutes circonstances, Gide s'est servi des auteurs auxquels il s'est intéressé, les adaptant à son usage et à ses besoins, s'en faisant constamment une pâture. C'est ensuite que, contrairement aux déclarations de Gide même qui, lui, tend à sous-estimer le rôle que Nietzsche a joué dans sa vie et dans son œuvre, cette influence a été considérable. Elle se dépiste nettement dans certains ouvrages: c'est sous le signe de Nietzsche que se doivent placer l'*Immoraliste*, par exemple, ou la *Porte Etroite*.

Avec raison l'auteur note que la déclaration de Gide: "Je ne suis jamais, je *deviens*," pourrait servir d'épigraphe à toute son œuvre comme à sa vie. Ce dynamisme essentiel de la personnalité de Gide trouve son juste reflet dans l'exposé de Mme Lang: il circule dans ses pages exemptes de tout pédantisme un souffle de vie que en rend la lecture fort agréable. A part certaines répétitions qui, comme il a été dit plus haut, étaient inévitables et dont on aurait mauvaise grâce à faire grief à l'auteur, la sagacité et la finesse qui caractérisent cet ouvrage en font le prix. Peut-être eût-il été désirable que, pour les verser au dossier, Mme Lang nous donne des renseignements un peu plus complets d'une part sur les auteurs allemands contemporains lus par Gide et de l'autre, sur les relations avec les écrivains dont il a fait la connaissance personnelle.[2] Mais dans l'ensemble, le terrain a été soigneusement couvert. En appendice, quelques lettres inédites de Gide, la liste chronologique de ses œuvres et de ses traductions, le répertoire des ouvrages mentionnés ou cités au cours de l'étude, la traduction des citations en langues étrangères, enfin un corps de notes abondant rappellent que sous le style élégant de Mme Lang se cachent une connaissance poussée de son auteur et un jugement averti.

JACQUELINE E. DE LA HARPE

University of California, Berkeley

GERMAN LITERATURE IN BRITISH MAGAZINES, 1750-1860. By Walter Roloff, Morton Mix, and Martha Nicolai. Edited by Bayard Quincy Morgan and A. R. Hohlfeld, with a Historical Foreword by A. R. Hohlfeld. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949. 364 p.

This very thorough and significant volume opens with Professor A. R. Hohlfeld's "Historical Foreword," to which I wish to devote my first remarks. By its mere presentation of facts, the foreword brings out clearly how significant a center of cultural mediation the German Department of the University of Wisconsin really was under Professor Hohlfeld's leadership. Inspired by a procomparative statement of Goethe's (which serves as a motto for the present book) and by the founding of Max Koch's *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, Holdfeld early made plans for what is now called the "Wisconsin Project in Anglo-German Literary Relations," which endeavored to investigate, above all, the reception of German literature in English and American magazines and the extent and quality of English translations of German literary works.

In the history of this Wisconsin circle of scholars, we meet the names of many esteemed friends and colleagues from all over the United States—Morgan and Price foremost among them, ably seconded by Aron, Barnstorff, Blankenagel, Bluhm, Bruns, Evans, Jantz, Ada Klett, Krummel, Meisnest, Nordmeyer, Rosenberg, von Grueningen, Wadepuhl, Whyte, and others. Of the sixty-four doctoral

[2] La question Rilke-Gide offrirait matière à plus ample investigation. Il en va de même en ce qui concerne Kafka qui, quoique tchèque d'origine, se place nettement dans la tradition allemande du roman.

theses directed by Professor Hohlfeld from 1901 to 1936, twenty-four were devoted to Anglo-German relations, and these form the hard core of the Wisconsin Project. By adding to these theses certain publications of his colleagues at Wisconsin and of colleagues and pupils who later went to other institutions, Professor Hohlfeld demonstrates that the project gradually assumed dimensions which, in the reviewer's mind, put it ahead of similar endeavors at other universities (Learned at Pennsylvania, Francke at Harvard, Faust at Cornell). We who are now making strenuous efforts to perpetuate and spread the ideals of comparative literature in America can profit greatly by this brief history of the Wisconsin Project which, so to speak, shows us comparative literature in action—and our journal is pleased to congratulate one of its most farsighted forerunners on a job superbly done and on a rich and inspiring life well spent.

While a considerable number of the twenty-four above-mentioned theses were published in one form or another, three of them, dealing with the reception of German literature in British magazines, remained unpublished and now form the content of this book. The work of W. E. Roloff (1912) covered the period 1750-1811, that of M. M. Mix (1920) the period 1750-1835, and that of Martha Nicolai (1937) the period 1835-60. Because of Professor Hohlfeld's tragically failing eyesight, it fell to Professor B. Q. Morgan to amalgamate and, in part, rewrite the three theses into one compact and fluent survey (pp. 37-114), and to reduce and coordinate the technical magazine references and long appendices of the three authors (pp. 115-364). Professor Morgan loyally accepted this challenging task because, he says, "I knew, almost as well as Hohlfeld himself, what was at stake. Not only was this investigation-triad the last important link in the long chain of the Wisconsin Project, it was—to change the figure—the keystone of the entire structure."

The present investigation offers two very welcome features. First, it gives a useful synthesis of the entire problem and, in doing so, it synchronizes all that Todt, Reed, Carré, Rea, Sellier, and others (not to speak of the broader works of Stokoe and Stockley) had written about Lessing, Gessner, Goethe, Schiller, and Kotzebue, respectively, in England. Second, by subjecting the echoes of German literature in British magazines to a mathematical as well as to an evaluative analysis, it presents, in skillfully done charts and graphs, definite numerical evidence to corroborate (and, very rarely, to refute) the often vague generalizations of previous investigators.

The first chapter speaks of the growing interest (1750-95), the short-lived enthusiasm and resulting reaction (1796-1800), the relative indifference (1801-15), the newly rising interest (1816-35), and the strength and stability of this interest in German literature (1836-60). The second chapter elaborates on these assertions by discussing the most prominent German authors, in alphabetical order. Interpolated statistical figures, though they must naturally be interpreted with caution, often give a clearer picture of trends than many pages of detailed discussions—for instance, from 1786 till 1800, we find 293 references to Kotzebue, 82 to Goethe, 58 to Schiller, 50 to Wieland, and 32 to Gessner; and for the entire period under discussion we find 697 references to Goethe, 524 to Schiller, 400 to Kotzebue, 142 to Gessner, and 133 to Wieland. Similar figures allow us to evaluate the relative popularity of individual works. In the case of Goethe, for instance, the *Poems* lead with 140 references, followed by *Faust* (119), *Werther* (86), *Fiction and Truth* (26), and among the *Poems* "Der Erlkönig" and "Der Fischer" lead (11 each), followed by "Der König in Thule" (10), "Der Sänger" and "Freudvoll und leidvoll" (7 each). Incontrovertible statistical data prove again what I have always found hard to understand in view of the common Anglo-German cause

against Napoleon—namely the decline of German influences, indeed, frequently bitter vituperations against these influences (see the *Anti-Jacobin*!) during the years 1800-15. A vast amount of exact and painstaking documentation is to be found in the list of references—250 pages with 5,515 items which constitute the bulk of this book.

It is to be deplored that the bibliography is not up to date. It can, of course, be argued that the editors had to stop where the three authors stopped, in 1912, 1920, and 1937, respectively. But it is regrettable that this principle prevented a book published in 1949 from including at least a brief consideration of the pertinent research in this field printed since 1937—I am thinking, for instance, of S. Liptzin's various studies on the reception of Heine in England or of S. L. Wormley's book on the same subject. A second reproach concerns such "German" authors as Gessner, Haller, Lavater, and others. It would, perhaps, have been asking too much to have these men grouped together in a small chapter dealing with the reception of Swiss literature in England; but in the various interesting paragraphs devoted to them they should at least have been provided with the proper national adjective.

In conclusion, a word of commendation about the fine quality of the photolith reproduction of this volume. Scholars who find it difficult to arrange for suitable publication of their investigations may increasingly wish to turn to the photolith process, if the quality of this neatly bound volume is indicative of the continued improvement of the new method. Few, however, will be able to equal Professor Morgan's skill in producing such a beautifully typed manuscript.

W. P. F.

DANTE'S AMERICAN PILGRIMAGE. A HISTORICAL SURVEY OF DANTE STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1800-1944. By Angelina La Piana. New Haven: Yale University Press (published for Wellesley College), 1948. 310 p.

For the past fifty years the sole comprehensive study of Dante's influence in America has been Theodor W. Koch's "Dante in America," which was published in the *Annual Report of the Dante Society* in 1896. Miss La Piana's timely and valuable book serves not only to complement and strengthen the picture of the period discussed by Koch, but also to bring the investigation up to date and analyze the astounding wealth of Dantesque influences that set in after the 1880s and last up to the present day. But, as the title implies, the book deals with critics, translators, scholars, and amateurs; it does not deal with Dante's influence upon American literature as such. In 1938 J. Chesley Mathews wrote a doctoral dissertation at the University of California entitled *Dante and Major American Writers, 1800-1867*. Though it was accepted by the Dante Society as a prize essay, the thesis unfortunately was not published; however, Dr. Mathews published excerpts in the *University of Texas Studies in English, Italica,* and *American Literature*. The work of Miss La Piana and Dr. Mathews tend to complement each other, although the latter broke off his investigation with Longfellow in 1867, thus leaving the problem of Dante's influence upon American literature from 1868 to 1948 for perhaps a third scholar to investigate.

After a somewhat leisurely but very interesting introduction starting with Italy and England, Miss La Piana sketches the slow growth of America's familiarity with the Middle Ages, and then begins (p. 24) with the Dante studies of William Dunlap (1791), Lorenzo da Ponte, William H. Prescott, and others. Four solid chapters are devoted to the core of the nineteenth century—to essayists like R. H. Wilde and Lowell, to early translators like Parsons and Emerson, to Longfellow

and Norton. Little need be said about these four fine chapters; they are immeasurably richer than anything Koch had given us.

The most amazingly informative chapter for me was the seventh, dealing with the last decades of the nineteenth century, which witnessed a strange peak of Dante's popularity among the intellectuals of Boston, the Catholics of New York, the Hegelians of St. Louis, and many good, Christian women all over America. After reading a statement from the *Southern Literary Messenger* that a "worn" copy of the *Vita Nuova* might be found in any boudoir of Charleston and after noticing that the *Ladies Home Journal* in 1894 published a good article on Dante by William Dean Howells, I am willing to admit that Miss La Piana's phraseology is not at all extravagant when she states (p. 140) that "during this period neither the great poets of classical antiquity nor those of modern literatures—outside the English—appealed as much to the American mind as the great Florentine did." Nor were popular books and lectures, moralists, amateurs, and women all there was to it, for the same decades witnessed the peak of Norton's activity, the founding of the Dante Society of America, and the beginnings of the famed Dante libraries at Cornell and Harvard.

In the second half of the book I should like to praise especially the eighth chapter on "The American Translations of the Divine Comedy in the Twentieth Century" (Johnson, Langdon, Anderson, Fletcher, How, etc.) and the thirteenth on "Dante's Portraits and Illustrations of the Divine Comedy" as fine examples of clear presentation of well-digested material.

One cannot find fault with Miss La Piana's scholarship; it is solid and above reproach. Whatever unimportant criticisms I have to make concern the form rather than the thought; for the author very often makes us almost lose sight of the general lines and the chief purpose of her book. Two examples will illustrate what I mean. The chapters on the great Cantabrigians contain far too many book reviews indicating how this essay or that translation was received. Such reviews, to be sure, are important; but, even so, they should not smother the pages devoted to Parsons or Longfellow and might more wisely have been relegated to footnotes. The same holds true for chapters nine to eleven, devoted to "Dante's American Biographers," "Realists and Symbolists," and "On Dante Criticism." Here we meet the honored names of America's recent great Dantists, from Professor C. H. Grandgent down; though we naturally want to know about their contributions, we would like to avoid being drawn into minute problems and arguments concerning the interpretation of this or that figure or incident. Here again, only a few striking facts need have been mentioned in connection with each study to allow us to keep our eyes on the main thread, which is *Dante in America*—and much that can be found between pp. 188 and 258 could have been placed in footnotes.

This system of presentation, on the other hand, forces Miss La Piana to put into a mere footnote many a fact which in itself, I think, is of great importance and would have deserved a better place. On p. 116, for instance, she contradicts the assumption, prevalent since the days of Plumptre, that Joseph Garrow, the author of the first published English translation of the *Vita Nuova* (Florence, 1846), was an American; in less than two lines she states that he was Irish and we hear no more of him. The footnote on p. 162 tells us the significant fact that from 1865 until 1944 nine translations of the entire *Commedia* have been made in America and five of the *Inferno*; on p. 194 we read that the first American edition of the Italian text of the *Commedia* (Witte's edition) was printed at Harvard in 1867. And, hidden away in the middle of a footnote on p. 215, we find that Norton's is still the only complete translation of the *Vita Nuova* made in America (though the publication of Emerson's translation of 1843 is planned for the near future).

I have found only two or three factual mistakes in this carefully and painstakingly prepared book; G. W. Featherstonhaugh dramatized the story of Ugolino, as stated in the footnote on p. 55, and not the story of Francesca da Rimini, as erroneously claimed on p. 151; Boker's name is usually spelled with a "k" and not with a "ck"; and J. D. M. Ford's prize essay of 1895 on *Dante's Influence upon Spanish Literature During the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* seems to have vanished from the Widener Library and might just as well be omitted from all future bibliographies.

In view of her fine qualifications, as shown in this work, Miss La Piana would be ideally suited to write the logical companion to the present volume and to analyze the influence of Dante upon American literature. Her discussions have but briefly touched upon, e.g., Longfellow's six sonnets and Boker's *Francesca da Rimini*; her list of poems in a footnote on p. 150, beginning with W. C. Bryant and O. W. Holmes, could serve as a guide towards the completion of a task which, it is to be hoped, will soon be undertaken.

W. P. F.

JOURNAL DE DELÉCLUZE: 1824-1828. Texte publié avec une Introduction et des notes par Robert Baschet. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1948. 514 p.

Sainte-Beuve, reviewing Delécluze's *Souvenirs de soixante années* in the *Nouveaux Lundis*,[1] called its author "bourgeois de Paris par excellence." In this remark, perhaps a little ironically depreciatory[2], are encompassed the limitations and the merits of the *Journal*. Later, elaborating on his idea, Sainte-Beuve described Delécluze as "a very sincere chronicler of the ideas and tastes of our times," and added that the voluminous journal Delécluze was known to keep would be "more interesting for our nephews than the most elegant academic dissertations."

It is true—and Sainte-Beuve was the first to recognize it—that the interest of Delécluze's *Journal* is limited by the somewhat unimaginative personality of its author. Delécluze, for forty years the conservative art critic of the *Journal des Débats*, had little originality of thought and showed too often in his tastes a deplorable narrowmindedness and pusillanimity. But these very defects and the seriousness of purpose and tone sensed behind each entry of the *Journal* may reassure the reader on the veracity of the facts recorded. Sainte-Beuve, at any rate, never doubted it and prized it greatly.

The *Journal* covers a relatively short time—1824 to 1828—but these few years were years of fermentation and turmoil preceding the great romantic explosion and social upheavals of the late Restoration, and even in the stiff observations of Delécluze their impact is felt. Delécluze, as "grand bourgeois de Paris," was a spectator—and in a smaller measure an actor—in the drama of ideas which was played around him. A pupil of the painter Louis David and devoted champion of

[1] Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux Lundis*, III (1862), p. 77. The present editor, Robert Baschet, published in 1942 excerpts from Delécluze's travel notes, *Carnet de route d'Italie*.

[2] Stendahl, a familiar of Delécluze's circle of friends, commented wittily and perhaps a little maliciously in his *Souvenirs d'Egotisme*: "C'est un caractère dans le genre du vicaire de Wakefield. Il faudrait, pour en donner une idée, toutes les demi-teintes de Goldsmith ou d'Addison... il a toutes les petitesses d'un bourgeois. S'il achète pour 35 francs une douzaine de mouchoirs chez le marchand du coin, deux heures après il croit que ses mouchoirs sont une rareté, et que pour aucun prix on ne pourrait en trouver de semblabes à Paris" (p. 174).

classicism in art,[3] he was in politics, however, a determined liberal who at times was wont to lose his Olympian calm when confronted by the reactionary laws proposed by the ultraconservative elements of the government. The return of the Jesuits to power particularly excited his anger. He accused them of destroying the benevolent reforms of the Revolution in promoting a law against the freedom of the press and against sacrilege. With his solid common sense, Delécluze appears in the pages of his *Journal* as a living symbol of a new influential class—the great French bourgeoisie, restless and liberal, but still cautious—the class that was to support the revolutions of 1830 and 1848. Delécluze worried when, mingling with the uneasy crowd surrounding the unpopular Charles X, he noted the ominous silence welcoming the king on parade. Such a scene recorded with matter-of-fact simplicity by Delécluze depicts more strikingly the political temper of the time than a page of history.

But, although the political aspect of the *Journal* is of great interest, its chief merits lie in the faithful day-to-day chronicle of contemporary literary life. Delécluze belonged to the relatively small group of people who, meeting in the fashionable salons of Paris and discussing stormily the burning questions of the day, prepared the coming of age of romanticism. On Tuesdays, he was found at Madame Ancelot's; on Wednesdays, at Viollet-le-Duc's or at Baron Gérard's; on Fridays, at Stapfer's; and on Saturdays at Cuvier's. He visited, besides, the salon of Madame Récamier, with whom he was on very friendly terms; there are many detailed accounts of the soirées of this famous company. But he kept his keenest observations and his most critical attention for his own "matinées du Dimanche." He was justly proud of the group that gathered weekly in his apartment, rue Chabanais.[4] There gathered Edouard Monod, enthusiast of Byron, Albert Stapfer, who first translated *Faust*, J. J. Ampère, Stendhal[5] and his friend Mareste, and later, Paul Louis Courier, Viollet-le-Duc, P. F. Dubois, director of the *Globe*, Duvergier de Hauranne, Ludovic Vitet, Charles de Rémusat, Dittmer, and Mérimée. The discussions were frank and noisy, and more than once Delécluze played the part of mediator in a heated argument. Most often debated was the eternal theme of the classicists versus the moderns, starting a long controversy about the form of the drama which was to culminate in the battle of *Hernani* in 1830,[6] and

[3] For forty years, Delécluze, under the signature of "Etienne," championed the cause of classicism. Empiricist and ideologue, he retained at the height of romanticism the aesthetic theories of Winckelmann and Lessing and was intolerant of any new approach to art. Strangely enough he seems to have borrowed the vocabulary of his revolutionary friend Stendhal, since, in his review of the *Salon* of 1824, he applied the term "homéristes" to the classicists and "shakespeariens" to the romantics. Of course, in his case the connotation was quite different from that of Stendhal.

[4] Sainte-Beuve says that these gatherings began in 1824. However, Stendhal notes in *Souvenirs d'Egotisme*, p. 172: "Je trouvais chez M. de l'Etang [Delécluze], devant un petit mauvais feu, car ce fut ce me semble en février 1822 qu'on m'y mena, huit ou dix personnes qui parlaient de tout. Je fus frappé de leur bon sens, de leur esprit et surtout du tact fin du maitre de la maison qui, sans qu'il y parût, dirigeait la discussion."

[5] "La trompette et le général d'avant-garde de la nouvelle révolution littéraire," declared Sainte-Beuve.

[6] The romantic drama, which was to achieve spectacular success with Victor Hugo's *Hernani*, was not at all to the taste of Stendhal and the early supporters of the romantic theater. They wished for some form of drama more simple in form, and rejected particularly the flamboyant versification of Victor Hugo. In the *Journal* can be found many references to the unpublished plays of Charles de

raising the touchy question of the superiority of Shakespeare over the French classical dramatists. It is interesting to note, in Delécluze's precise reports, the fluctuations of opinions of the Parisian public on hearing the first representations of Shakespeare's plays in English. The very first, in July 1822, met with conspicuous failure; this frigid reception aroused the anger of the partisans of the moderns and particularly of Stendhal who, in 1825, wrote a stinging pamphlet, *Racine et Shakespeare*, directed against the Academy. In September 1827, however, another troupe of English players came to Paris, and their presentation of *Hamlet* and *Romeo and Juliet* was a great success. Delécluze's attitude reflects amusingly that of the general public—respectful and admiring, and yet considerably puzzled by Shakespeare's language.[7] But it is only fair to say that Delécluze was sufficiently attracted by Shakespeare to learn English in order to read him and to join a small club consecrated exclusively to the reading of Shakespeare's plays.

The "Sundays" of Delécluze were indeed important. The political liberalism so much in evidence then gave a new vitality to the romantic revolution in literature, and helped to transform the first phase of romanticism, highly individualistic and politically conservative in its incipient form, into a second phase, more fecund and far-reaching in its newly awakened social interest. Thus was achieved the conciliation of two tendencies hitherto inimical— romanticism and liberalism. The uncertainty of the intellectual temper of the times is reflected in Delécluze as we see him oscillate between the poles of ultraconservatism in art and political liberalism. For serious students of the *Zeitgeist* of that troubled age, the candid observations of a Delécluze are invaluable.

"Petits faits vrais," first-hand reports[8] by a diligent observer, help us to recreate the intellectual milieu neglected too long for the exclusive study of the great writers. To be sure, first-rate literary figures represent the intellectual temper of an epoch at its best, but to ignore the lesser ones, often the germ bearers of new thought, is to run the danger of losing the proper perspective on the actual growth of ideas. Besides, to lift the great artists above their intellectual and social background and appraise them as isolated phenomena is to deprive them of much of their vitality and humanity. This lesson is illustrated by the *Journal*, where such fascinating figures as Stendhal and Mérimée appear brilliantly alive against the more sedate backdrop of Delécluze's salon. Stendhal particularly, losing his shyness among trusted friends, showed himself at his best; and his host succeeded

---

Rémusat, *L'Insurrection de Saint Domingue* and *La Féodalité*, prose dramas inspired by the discussions of the group. These would prove very interesting for students of the development of the romantic drama. Of course, Mérimée's *Théâtre de Clara Gazul* was also widely discussed.

[7] "Dans tous les drames de Shakespeare vous voyez figurer des gens qui, lorsqu'ils sont dans leur assiette ordinaire, parlent tout à fait familièrement et qui ne quittent ordinairement ce langage que pour exprimer les sentiments les plus étranges et dans le style le plus boursouflé; à chaque instant, dans les pièces, on passe d'un dialogue, non seulement écrit en prose, mais exprimant les idées les plus vulgaires, à la poésie assez ordinairement aussi boursouflée dans ses formes qu'elle est exaltée par le sens." *Journal*, p. 459.

[8] Delécluze wrote calmly each Sunday evening "pour son bonnet de nuit," said Sainte-Beuve, a detailed account of the discussions of the day, while Stendhal was eager to gather all literary, political, and artistic news possible for the numerous articles he was then sending to English magazines, particularly the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Paris Monthly Review*. Delécluze was often shocked by the levity and exuberance of Stendhal and what he calls "ses fantaisies folles."

admirably in conveying to us the famous Stendhalian exuberance and sarcastic good humor.

Comparatists are indebted to Delécluze for the honest and detailed chronicle of an important phase of literary history, and to Robert Baschet for an excellent critical edition of the *Journal*. It should prove a valuable addition to the bibliography of romanticism.

MARIE D. MOLLES-STEIN

Los Angeles, California

BOOKS RECEIVED

Atkins, Stuart Pratt. The Testament of Werther in Poetry and Drama. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. xiii, 322 p.

Bonno, Gabriel. La Culture et la civilisation britanniques devant l'opinion française de la paix d'Utrecht aux *Lettres Philosophiques* (1713-1734). Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1948. 184 p. [Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new series, vol. 38, part 1.]

Curtius, Ernst Robert. Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter. Bern: Francke, 1948. 601 p.

Hok, Ruth Carter. Edouard Estaunié: The Perplexed Positivist. New York: King's Crown Press, 1949. 116 p.

Sackton, Alexander H. Rhetoric as a Poetic Language in Ben Jonson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. viii, 182 p.

Mallarmé, Stéphane. Dix poèmes de Stéphane Mallarmé. Exégèses de E. Noulet. Lille: Giard; Genève: Droz, 1948. xv, 155 p.

Muller, Siegfried H. Gerhart Hauptmann and Goethe. New York: King's Crown Press, 1949. x, 113 p.

Nossing, Anne F. Heine in Italia nel secolo decimonono. New York: S. F. Vanni, 1948. 383 p.

Quaderni Internazionali: Poesia VIII. Milano: Mondadori, 1947. 244 p.

Rousseau, J.-J. Lettre à Mr. D'Alembert sur les spectacles. Edition critique par M. Fuchs. Lille: Giard; Genève: Droz, 1948. xlviii, 208 p.

Scalvini, Giovita. Foscolo, Manzoni, Goethe: Scritti editi e inediti. Torino: Einaudi, 1948. 460 p.

Siculorum gymnasium: Rassegna semestrale della facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Catania. New series I, 1 (Jan.-June 1948).

Terstegge, Sister Georgiana. Providence as *Idée-Maîtresse* in the Works of Bossuet (Theme and Stylistic Motif). Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1948. x, 257 p.

Thompson, Stith. The Folktale. New York: Dryden Press, 1946. x, 510 p.

Tosi, Guy (editor). Gabriele D'Annunzio à Georges Hérelle: Correspondance accompagnée de douze sonnets cisalpins. Introduction, traduction et notes de Guy Tosi. Paris: Denoël, 1946. 436 p.

Yale French Studies, II, no. 2, Literature and Ideas, 1949. 110 p.

Yates, Frances A. The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century. London: Warburg Institute, 1947. xii, 376 p.